LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
JAN 1918
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BX 7117 .E28 1853 v.2
Edwards, B. B. 1802-1852.
Writings of Professor B. B.
Edwards

100 Washington
Boston.

Thos W. Dickerson,

1853

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
JAN 21 1918
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

WRITINGS

OF

PROFESSOR B. B. EDWARDS,

WITH A MEMOIR

BY

EDWARDS A. PARK.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. II.

BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY JOHN P. JEWETT AND COMPANY.
CLEVELAND, OHIO:
JEWETT, PROCTOR, AND WORTHINGTON.
LONDON: SAMPSON LOW, SON, & CO.
1853.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1853, by
JOHN P. JEWETT AND COMPANY,
in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the District of Massachusetts.

CAMBRIDGE: METCALF AND COMPANY,
PRINTERS TO THE UNIVERSITY.

CONTENTS OF VOL. II.

ESSAYS: ADDRESSES: LECTURES.

I.

PAGE

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC RELIGION IN ITALY 1

II.

SLAVERY IN ANCIENT GREECE 44

III.

ROMAN SLAVERY IN THE EARLY CENTURIES OF THE CHRISTIAN ERA 79

IV.

SLAVERY IN THE MIDDLE AGES 113

V.

CLASSICAL STUDIES 131

VI.

FEMALE EDUCATION 148

VII.

THE POETRY OF WORDSWORTH 183

VIII.

REASONS FOR THE STUDY OF THE HEBREW LANGUAGE . . 206

IX.

EARLY ENGLISH VERSIONS OF THE BIBLE 234

X.

AUTHENTICITY AND GENUINENESS OF THE PENTATEUCH . 281

1. The Importance of Caution in an Inquiry of this Nature . 288
2. Historical Scepticism less Prevalent now than formerly . 291
3. Credibility of the Jewish Historians 303
4. Early Origin of Alphabetic Writing 306
5. The Language and Style of the Pentateuch do not prove its later Origin 327
6. The Command of God in Respect to the Destruction of the Canaanites vindicated 342

XI.

THE IMPRECATIONS IN THE SCRIPTURES 364

XII.

HEBREW POETRY 384

XIII.

IMPORTANCE OF A THOROUGH THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION . 414

XIV.

CHRISTIANS SHOULD STUDY THE PROFOUNDER MYSTERIES OF THEIR FAITH 435

XV.

COLLATERAL SIGNS OF HUMAN DEPRAVITY 454

XVI.

INFLUENCE OF EMINENT PIETY ON THE INTELLECTUAL POWERS 472

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC RELIGION IN ITALY.*

Over the door of the Basilica of St. John Lateran in Rome are the words: "Sacro sancta Lateranensis Ecclesia, omnium urbis et orbis Ecclesiarum Mater et Caput." This is no idle boast. The realm over which Augustus Cæsar swayed his sceptre was narrow, compared with that of his spiritual successor. The encyclical letter which emanates from the Quirinal Palace is addressed to one half the civilized world, and binds the consciences of a fourth of the human race. What is the complexion of this religion at home? What are its features when seen on its native soil? Does the heart of the great system beat with energy, or does it give signs of decay and dissolution? We are naturally interested in visiting the spring of a mighty river, in examining the elements of an influence that has shaped the destiny of the world through one third of its duration.

When viewed historically the subject is one of extraordi-

* An Address delivered before the Theological Society, Dartmouth College, July 26, the Society for Religious Inquiry, University of Vermont, July 31, and the Knowles Rhetorical Society, Newton Theological Institution, August 22, 1848.

nary interest. It is often said that men are never aroused in the highest degree, except on religious grounds; that to accomplish a great and difficult political object, the conscience must be invoked; motives that reach beyond the grave must be appealed to. In Italy this complexity of motives, this intermingling of human passions with the awful sanctions of religion, this blending of civil and ecclesiastical interests, have been witnessed as they have been nowhere else. Political conspiracies have been concealed or disclosed on pain of eternal death. The darkest crimes against the State have been committed on the promise of God's forgiveness. The police have found their readiest coadjutors or their bitterest foes at the confessional. Elsewhere the State has trampled on the Church. In other countries, the Church is the obsequious handmaid of the political power, is chained to the chariot-wheel of kings and cabinets. In Rome an aged priest has united all the offices of the Jewish theocracy. Senators and armies, councils and courts, have done the bidding of a superannuated monk.

The extraordinary events which have rapidly followed each other, and which are now occurring, through all Southern and Western Europe, clothe this topic with especial interest. What effect will these political revolutions exert on the established and dominant religion? Will they essentially weaken its hold on the affections of the people? Will they undermine all prescriptive rights? If ecclesiastical reforms shall follow in the train of those which are municipal or civil, will such reforms endanger the supremacy of the Catholic system? Should all State patronage be withdrawn, has the Church a recuperative force so that she could adapt herself to the new order of society? Or, if the Catholic system should be utterly subverted, would any

desirable form of Protestantism take its place? Would the destruction of that old hierarchy put an end to the spirit of bigotry and persecution? Wherein is a radical and nominal Protestantism better than that ancient church tyranny?

The subject, moreover, vitally concerns us as American scholars and Christians. Papal Europe, even Italy herself, looks to this country with eager curiosity and hope. Uncounted multitudes constantly find an asylum here. At the present time, in no national legislature except our own would the members of the Company of Jesus find upholders and apologists. With, in some respects, a feeble, negative, hesitating Protestantism, with paralyzing divisions in our own ranks, in the absence of comprehensive plans, and especially of a gentle and Christian spirit in our religious discussions, there may be imminent danger to our institutions. Exact acquaintance with the spirit of those with whom we have to deal, becomes a necessity which cannot well be exaggerated.

Our object, in the first place, will be to point out some of the causes of the growth of the Roman Catholic system in Italy, and of its existence through so many ages. It is customary to think of that hierarchy as founded on error exclusively, on childish superstitions, or on stupendous falsehoods. The judgments often passed upon it are indignant and summary, rather than discriminating and just, — the decisions of a heated zeal, not of patient and dispassionate inquiry. Now it is inconceivable that a system could have existed so long, unless it had some sound and vigorous roots. If it had not possessed ingredients of truth and permanence, it would have been torn up ages ago, utterly prostrated in some of the rude shocks it has encountered. Its

inherent vigor is demonstrated by its existence for fifteen hundred years.

The Roman Catholic system is characterized by extraordinary contrasts and heterogeneous elements. In one aspect it is so weak that it seems to be tottering to its fall; in another, its strength is impregnable. Now it should seem that it must yield to the force of irrefragable argument and uncontradicted fact; now the Protestant advocate feels that he himself needs weapons of the keenest temper and an arm of practised ability. No one who has looked into the Romish system will despise it. No one who has encountered the Romish dialectics can fail to be impressed with their unmatched subtlety.

1. The long duration and flourishing state of the Roman Catholic system in Italy, have been owing in a degree to the physical features of the country and to the historical associations. Italy is the native region of beauty. The water, the earth, the air, the sunlight, seem to have an inherent and peculiar charm. A distinguished German painter, Angelica Kaufmann, said that she could not paint away from Rome; there was an artistic quality in the water. Much of the delightful scenery is admirably fitted to give effect to the gorgeous ceremonial of the Romish Church. The volcanic regions of the South, with their constant chemical changes, afford many facilities for a deceptive and imposing superstition.

The Papal religion is one that cometh by observation, by pomp and outward circumstance. It needs the open air. In the bleak regions of the North it is robbed of half its impressiveness. Some of the most striking portions of its ritual cannot be displayed within the walls of a church. Its crosses must be consecrated at the road-side. Its torches

and funeral wailing need the darkness and silence of the night heavens.

The country, too, is old ; it is full of hoary reminiscences, reaching beyond the time of the Romans ; the line between fable and history is ill defined. The country is most perfectly fitted to a religion which clings tenaciously to the past, which has an immutable faith, and which, instead of relying on reason, independent judgment, and a thorough private study of the Bible, has appealed to the sentiment, to the fancy and the outward sense. In short, it is a religion which has seized on every advantage furnished by its locality, adroitly turning the laws of nature to its own benefit.

2. The Romish system in Italy relies in a measure on its antiquity. It has existed almost from the Apostolic age. The great sects of Protestantism seem but children of yesterday. This Church says her masses at altars built or begun before the time of Constantine. It has placed its great symbol in the Flavian amphitheatre, commenced by Vespasian. It has charge of those solemn subterranean chapels, on whose dark walls is carved the palm-branch of the martyrs.* Her litanies were chanted by Ambrose and Augustine. On the stones of her Appian Way, as they now lie, Apostles and Evangelists walked.

This appeal to antiquity derives its support from several sources. It has its foundation in the nature of man, in one of his primary and strongest tendencies. We naturally reverence what is old. We cling to by-gone days. Amid the shifting scenes of the present and the uncertainties of

* Both the crown and palm-branch are borrowed from Paganism; but they received additional significance to the Christian from the mention of them in the book of Revelation. — *Maitland's Church in the Catacombs*, p. 177.

the future, we fondly disentomb the long-buried past. The feeling is not confined to one class of men. The illiterate and the learned alike share in it. Respect for the aged is the marked characteristic of the whole Oriental world. The removal of ancient landmarks has been guarded by heavy imprecations. An old Bible, the heirloom of several generations, is often the most precious family treasure. Of this vital and universal attribute of man, the Italian Church avails herself to the utmost. Mighty empires have disappeared; she remains. The palaces of the Cæsars have crumbled long ago; the Apostolic faith still lives in its primeval bloom, attracting fresh veneration, greeted with a more passionate love, as ages pass away.

Again, she has adroitly strengthened this sentiment, by appealing to the abuse and perversion of the opposite. Innovation is sometimes followed by bitter fruits, often so at first, when the ultimate effect may be beneficial. A popular revolution ends in despotism, freedom of speech in licentiousness, freedom of thinking in heartless infidelity. Reform is only the cloak under which some discontented spirits hide their ambitious designs. Democracy in Church and State is only another name for anarchy. Every unsuccessful experiment of this nature, and history is full of them, has been eagerly seized by this conservative Church, and turned to the utmost practical account. Not a little of her power is traceable to this source. She has selected with a sagacious eye, and with a far-reaching policy, the most disastrous events in Protestant history, the most melancholy facts in the annals of perverted reason. How much better, she has proudly asked, is the boasted country of Martin Luther, iron-bound by a godless rationalism, than what men call ignorant and superstitious Italy? Which is to be pre-

ferred, the order-loving and tolerant cantons in Catholic Switzerland, with a few peaceable, Jesuit schoolmasters, or those democratic Protestant districts where a portion of the people at this moment cannot celebrate the Lord's Supper but at the peril of life?

Another source of this influence is the mellowing effect of time. The evil that men do is buried with them; the good lives, and is evermore hallowed. Errors and weaknesses disappear behind the dusky veil of time; good and great actions stand out in the boldest relief. Critically to analyze the character of the men whom we idolize, would be like desecrating the tomb of a father. Hence there prevails an idea of the faultless character of the piety of the primitive Church, which has no foundation in reality. Hence the Italian Catholic looks only on the great illuminated points in the history of his Church, passing over the valleys covered with darkness, the marshes stagnant and redolent with all corruption. To his eye, his mother Church in her long, bright history seems like the queen of Oriental cities, sitting on the shore of the narrow sea in paradisiacal beauty. We listen to some of the Ambrosian chants or the mediæval hymns, sung in a temple moss-grown through seven hundred years; the words have an indescribable tenderness, an unearthly solemnity, as they float among the arches, and linger around the marble columns, and wander along the fretted roof. As the *Stabat Mater Dolorosa* peals from the organ and from voices without number, we seem to hear those wailing tones and catch the very accents of the holy women who came to see that great sight; and we forget the fatal theological error which lurks in those awful sounds or in those words which embody the very soul of music. No other church has such treasures, because every other is comparatively modern.

3. The Italian Church has been sustained in part by permanent funds, or by a large, fixed capital. We do not refer so much to the religious foundations, monasteries, nunneries, and institutions of the like nature, as to the endowments which support the parish churches, and those which are devoted to the direct extension of Papacy. The former stand on a more precarious tenure, and have often been confiscated or swept away in a revolution. But the capital which has maintained the parochial clergy has been, whatever may be the case in the future, one of the firmest supports of the system. In Tuscany, which has about two thirds of the population of the State of New York, the permanent funds for the maintenance of the regular clergy amount to several millions of dollars. Whatever is not necessary to the support of the priest is scrupulously distributed to the poor.* This provision places the clergy in a position independent in a measure of the people, while it does not diminish their influence over their flocks. What an efficient instrument for the extension of the Catholic faith has been the Congregation de Propaganda Fide at Rome, — an entire street filled with its imposing edifices! Its presses in number, its types in variety of languages, its pupils gathered literally from the four quarters of the earth, are a most striking practical proof that the ubiquity of the Catholic Church is not a mere rhetorical exaggeration. It

* Florence, e. g., is divided into parishes; there is generally in each parish one parish church, besides other churches and chapels; to each church belong benefices more or less, which are in the hands of patrons, rich families, and others; these benefices vary in value from fifty to one hundred or two hundred dollars; there is often great competition for them among the young priests, there being more applicants than places. The candidate must possess a living worth fifty dollars before he can make application. The funds of a church are in the hands of a sacristan.

is sometimes said, that nothing but ardent love to Christ and true faith in His word will sustain a foreign missionary for a series of years in a barbarous and pagan country. Yet the pupils of the Propaganda, and other adherents of this religion, have exhibited in unnumbered instances and through long centuries the most unshaken zeal and the most heroic courage. Either they have been animated by the true Christian spirit, or else the general proposition just referred to is not founded in fact. No isolated efforts, no merely voluntary contributions, could ever accomplish what that celebrated society has done. The order of Jesuits is not an exception. They have been, as is well known, the founders of the most splendid churches, the authors or promoters of the largest permanent foundations belonging to the Catholic hierarchy, themselves in turn supported by these foundations.

St. Peter's church itself may be regarded as a permanent fund, whose value for the Papacy arithmetic can hardly compute. It stands as the noblest representative of the unity of the Catholic faith, in unapproached grandeur by any edifice now standing, or that was ever built by Greek or Roman, and which Michael Angelo said he labored upon for the love of God. This church, by its history, by its associations with the earlier edifice which stood on the same spot, by its faultless proportions, by its effects every year on the thousands who behold it, Protestants and Catholics, the guides of taste and public sentiment in their respective countries, becomes a support to the system which words have no power to delineate, is an investment for that Church immeasurably richer than the marble and the gold which so profusely adorn it.*

* The ancient basilica had existed above one thousand years. The

May it not be a question, whether we have not seriously and unnecessarily weakened the influence of Protestantism by encouraging the tendency which would abandon all aid from permanent endowments, which would teach us to rely exclusively on the spontaneous liberality of the Christian Church? May we not thereby have reason to apprehend evils of no inconsiderable magnitude? Have we not, on this subject, anticipated a period which is yet far off, relying on a steady philanthropy, a warm and uniform Christian charity, which does not now exist? May we not expose an institution of great importance, or, what is of more value, minds of fine accomplishments in the Christian ministry, whose training has been very costly, to the caprice of a fickle and arbitrary majority, or to the persecution of an unrelenting minority, where all independence of mind, all honorable feeling, is sacrificed to the fashions or caprices of an hour, where the only alternative is cowardly compliance with what conscience and reason do not approve, or starvation?

By fostering this prejudice, this ill-considered tendency,

---

first stone of the new edifice was laid in 1506 by Julius II. The plan was traced by Bramante, who conceived the idea of the dome from Brunelleschi's effort at Florence. His successor, under Leo X., was Giulio di San Gallo; then Raphael with five assistants; then Antonio di San Gallo; then Michael Angelo, who erected the greater part of the dome; he was succeeded by several architects, till 1654, nearly two centuries from the time at which the idea of building it was entertained, when the essential parts were completed, at a cost of 47,000,000 of scudi, about £11,000,000. "The gorgeous dome, suspended in mid-air, is a firmament; the place indeed has an atmosphere of its own, and in this vastest of cathedrals the temperature knows no change; neither the enervating *scirocco*, nor the piercing *tramontana*, nor winter nor summer, influences the soft air of this mighty temple." — *Cooke's Rome*, p. 40.

we have manifestly put it out of our power to promote certain objects, which urgently need a permanent basis, which cannot from the nature of the case appeal to popular support, and which — such is the hostility that has been excited against every proposition of the kind — cannot receive the aid of those individuals, who might otherwise possess that enlargement of mind which would lead them to become efficient patrons. Because of some minor evils, or of some fancied and groundless fears, we reject that which the wisdom of ages has approved, and which has been essential to build up both the true and the false systems of learning and of faith.

The two ancient universities in England have never been what they ought to have been; neither are they now what they should be. These great endowments have been the sources of evils both to Church and State. Yet no one could have the hardihood to assert that the evils have been preponderant, that these foundations have not been the sources of good, great and inestimable. The warmest friend of spontaneous charity, and of an unceasing appeal to popular sympathy, could not wish to see them demolished, or their princely revenues dissipated.

4. Italian Catholicism has one of its main supports in the Fine Arts.

Three questions here naturally occur. What is the value of these objects of art? What connection have they with the Roman Catholic religion? What will be their probable influence hereafter?

In answer to the first question, it may be said that no value can be placed upon the principal objects. The price is beyond estimation or conjecture. Perhaps no article of property, movable or fixed, can be compared with them in

worth. They could not be exchanged for fine gold. Crown jewels, the regalia of kings, the revenue of diamond mines, would be no temptation to the owners of these objects. Gold can be purchased ; it is a vulgar article of commerce ; diamonds can be dug out of the earth ; but no Promethean art can reillumine the soul of Raphael, or spread before him those visions of superhuman beauty. The wealth of the Indies could not replace the Apollo, were it destroyed. The Sistine Chapel could be painted only by him who hung the dome of St. Peter's.

All the capitals of Italy, and most of the principal cities, contain galleries filled with objects which become the more precious as time advances. Years of intelligent and patient and genial study cannot exhaust them, can only help one to begin to understand them, any more than the genius of Homer or of Milton can be comprehended in a day or a year. Two or three of these Italian masters stand on the same unapproachable elevation with those great poets that shine with a never-setting light. These galleries, these immortal works are not locked up, are not secluded from the vulgar gaze, like the idols of the East, but they are visited and studied by all Christendom, Catholic and Protestant. They are the goal of pilgrims as fervent as ever wound their way to the shrine of a prophet. They are moulding the taste, shaping the sentiments, and determining the character of some of the leading minds of the age, — of all who have any power to appreciate beauty in its deathless forms.

The second inquiry is, How are these objects of art connected with the Roman Catholic religion ? Rather we may ask, Wherein are they not interfused and incorporated, made to breathe an influence which is ever insinuating and

all but universal? The religion is addressed, in a pre-eminent degree, especially in its practical workings, to the imagination, the fancy, the feelings, the outward sense. It seeks to take the reason captive by filling the eye with tears, by enchanting the ear, and by stirring all the sensibilities of our nature. Admiration is the mother of devotion; God, through the medium of the Virgin, is influenced by tears and passionate outcries and wailing lamentations. To the building up of this stupendous system, kings, patriarchs, popes, councils, theologians, monks, missionaries, have not been the sole, perhaps not the principal, contributors. The gods of Papal Rome were made by the chisel and the pencil of more cunning workmen than these. Craftsmen more honored in life than any of the Gregories or Leos, and since their death canonized with a profounder homage, lent all the charms of their inimitable genius to support and adorn what they could not enough honor. One of them sleeps in the Pantheon, whom, when he was alive, men regarded with religious veneration, as if God had revealed Himself through Him, as he did in former days by the prophets. The tomb of another is in the Westminster Abbey of Florence, by the side of those of Machiavelli, Galileo, and Dante.

The position of the Holy Virgin in the Romish system is well known. It has been often observed that the degree of reverence paid to the sacred persons is in the following order: the Virgin, her Divine Son, God the Father. Fourteen festivals in the calendar are dedicated especially to her honor. Churches innumerable bear her name. Altars the most sacred and cherished are fragant with incense to her coequal glory. Everywhere and in all possible forms she is adored. Yet the most worthy offering ever presented to

her was the genius of Raphael. She was the ideal of all heavenly beauty for ever floating before him, the subject of his dreams by night, his toils by day. Nowhere does his genius revel so as upon her form. Never have all the types and symbols and conceptions of beauty been so etherealized as in the touch of his pencil on this entrancing theme. The gems of the richest collections in Europe are Raphael's Madonnas.

The same remarks apply substantially to most of the other masters of painting. The great attraction at Parma is Correggio's picture, the most remarkable figures in which are the Madonna and child, Mary Magdalene, and Jerome. "The eminently grand picture" of the academy of Venice is the Assumption of the Virgin by Titian. A Madonna, unlike any other, sweet and beautiful exceedingly, is that by Andrea del Sarto in the Pitti palace at Florence. In the academy at Bologna, the visitor is instantly attracted to the Madonna della Pietà of Guido; and so in many other places. The artists have lavished the resources of the highest genius in making the Roman Catholic religion visible, in embodying it in breathing forms, in commending its most objectionable features, through the fascinations of an inimitable coloring, to all men of accomplished minds. To reject a doctrine presented in this form seems to be a rebellion against the canons of taste, an extinguishing of the lights of learning and civilization. Not to palliate or overlook an anti-Scriptural dogma, or a fatal error, when it is surrounded with all the illusions of genius, is a barbarism which multitudes of Protestants would shrink from being guilty of. Those who would on no account kiss a relic or worship the host, will, yielding up their better judgment, bestow their warmest admiration upon the still more objec-

tionable forms of pictured or sculptured beauty. An idolatrous attachment to some of the Christian fathers is one of the sins of the Roman Catholic Church. But this is a peccadillo, or in a great measure atoned for, if the artist has added his imperishable sanction. The worship of images has been the reproach of the Papal Church for ages; yet, in the view of many Protestants even, it seems a venial offence, as they gaze on the fresco and mosaic, or the marble standing before them, wrought with cunning skill and almost warm with life. It is a total perversion of the design of a church to crowd it with specimens of art or antiquity, to make it, as it often is in Europe, a museum or a picture gallery. It is said that there are nearly fourteen thousand granite columns in Rome, relics of the times of the empire, and more than six thousand antique columns of marble, many of which are in the churches, and thus become to multitudes objects of intenser interest than the worship of God, or the doctrines of Christ.*

The remaining question is, What will be the position and influence of the Fine Arts hereafter? How far will the Roman Catholic Church rest on them as among its firmest supports?

That they will supply one of the moulding influences of society, even in its best and most Christian state, there can be no doubt. Some of the productions of the great masters, should they be spared in the accidents of time, can never cease to be the teachers of the world, because they are addressed to a primary and imperishable part of our nature, because they furnish correct and most awakening

* Burton's Rome, II. p. 115.

conceptions of truth, and excite the religious feelings in a degree compared with which spoken words have little power. For example, the pictures of the Crucifixion and the Last Judgment by Rubens, and of the Transfiguration by Raphael, are coincident with Scriptural truth, and will haunt the memory, and awaken awful fear, or profound adoration, or tender love, days and weeks after they are withdrawn from the sight. These works are an index of what the human soul is capable of effecting, and their direct tendency is to fill the mind with exalted views of the glory of Him who breathed into man the breath of genius. They present before him who gazes upon them an ideal of excellence in the highest degree exciting and influential, whatever be the nature of his pursuits. In possessing susceptibilities that can derive satisfaction from such sources, he is inwardly exalted. By the aid of this almost spiritual pencilling, he can grasp some of those conceptions which would be otherwise dim and shadowy. In this world we do not need intellect nor truth, but that power that will excite the soul, and fasten it on the truth and beauty with which its own depths and all objective nature are filled.

Now it is in vain to say that this is mere fancy, a momentary impression which produces no practical effect on the heart and life. A man may be educated for heaven by the reflex influence of the thoughts and aspirations of his own soul, as truly as by a precept or an objective motive. The more pure and elevated one's feelings are on any subject, the more laden his mind is with all the symbols of grace and beauty, the more able he will be to resist the allurements to evil by which he is beset.

No true Protestant would, indeed, undertake to apologize for the creations of taste and art in Italy, so far as they mis-

interpret or confound Scriptural truth, or inculcate theological error, or excite unworthy passions and criminal desires. In the reformed and better age which we believe is coming, all such productions will be swept away, or estimated as we now estimate the fables of Greek mythology. In that better period, too, these pursuits will not usurp a place which does not belong to them, but will assume their appropriate and subordinate position. But till that purer state of society arrives, the Roman Catholic Church in Italy will continue to rest on the Fine Arts as one of its surest foundations. The growth of ages, what is so incorporated into the habits and feelings, associated with the most affecting periods of human life, the most touching offices of the Church, and the holiest recollections of history, will not be easily relinquished.

Besides, there are powerful influences in the Protestant world, which are coincident and corroborating. The ritual and the practices of the Lutheran Communion on the continent of Europe are but very partially reformed. Many of their church edifices can with difficulty be distinguished from the Papal. Much of the finest poetry of the present day, the best of the romances, and the most splendid essay-writing, lend all their charms and power in strengthening the very tendency on which the Papal system reposes. The claims of theological truth and the great interests of mankind are made to yield to the charms of diction, to poetic fancy, or to a false liberality. The worshippers of the fine arts in most of the Protestant countries of Europe were never more numerous or enthusiastic than they are at this moment, never more willing to sacrifice truth to outward beauty, never more willing to promote by their example what in profession they would disown. The fasci-

nations of genius are in some instances an apology for what is no more nor less than undisguised sensualism. The pious and Protestant king of Prussia has now in his national collection in Berlin two or three productions exquisite in art, but which would not be openly exposed in the States of the Church in Italy.

5. The system has been sustained by means of the truth which it includes in its creeds and formularies. It is owing to the same reason in part that the Mohammedan faith has been able to maintain an independent existence so long. Truth cannot be wholly buried up. It has a certain innate and recuperative energy. It may be darkened and perverted; it may be mixed with sophisms, or ingeniously explained away, or caricatured; during long ages it may seem to have left the world to a dead formalism or to a malignant fanaticism; yet it secretly operates in some hearts. Like those influences which are at work in the hard, wintry ground, it is silently preparing its forces, and will in due time reveal some little spots of cheerful verdure.

The Decrees of the Council of Trent are the authorized standard of the Catholic Church. No fault can be found with a considerable portion of these articles, and of the explanations which are subjoined. All Protestant churches would fully accord with important parts of the Confession. Indeed, the creeds of some of the Protestant churches are in a large measure only a translation from the Romish. Unwise explanations, acute and groundless distinctions, the insertion of positive error, the multiplication of unauthorized observances, or even the immoral lives of not a few who administer the system, do not wholly change its nature, cannot entirely exclude its redeeming influence. Not seldom, some individuals, whose hearts have been touched by di-

vine grace, have been able to maintain their ground in the Catholic Church, though they have boldly preached some saving truths, and neglected or denounced the pernicious errors by which they were surrounded.

Such appear to be some of the principal reasons for the protracted existence and comparatively flourishing state of the Italian Church. Her errors in doctrine, and her anti-Christian practices find, indeed, a vigorous nourishment in the tendencies of depraved human nature. But unmixed error and superstition, or unadulterated depravity, cannot be the sole cause of the long duration of this Church. Her strength lies in the artful commingling of good and evil elements, in having at her command resources for the most adroit management, in being able to appeal to some of the most innocent, as well as powerful, tendencies of our nature, in taking advantage of varying events in Providence and of the changing aspects of society, and in being able to point to such men as Bernard and Borromeo, Pascal and Fenelon and the present Bishop of Rome, as undoubted proof of the excellent fruits which the system is fitted to produce.

We shall now proceed, in the second place, to adduce some of the causes of the weakness of the Roman Catholic system, especially, though by no means exclusively, as it exists in Italy; and shall enumerate some of the facts which prove that this system is in conflict with the Bible, with sound reason, and with the advancement of society, and which assure us of its reformation or its ultimate overthrow.

One preliminary remark is important. The Italian Catholic does not see with our eyes. He does not examine his

system through a Protestant medium. His principles of inquiry are not drawn from the inductive philosophy. The priest, educated under a different system of dialectics, is not familiar with that large, round-about, common sense of which Locke writes, and which we are accustomed to apply to a religious system. We are sometimes amazed that a Roman Catholic does not look at a church question as we are taught to examine it. In his religious services, we may continually witness scenes so trivial and contemptible, that we are astonished at the gravity of the principal performers, and at the gullibility of the awe-stricken crowd. But the Romish priest is trained to substitute ingenuity for argugument, plausible suppositions for facts, subtle discrimination for solid reasoning. There is indeed little common ground between the Protestant and Catholic theologian. The mind of the latter has been trained for ages in a manner so unlike that of an intelligent Protestant, that it seems to be a hopeless task to try to overthrow the Catholic hierarchy by argument. So it is with the mass of the devotees. They seem to have lost or never possessed the power to perceive what is ludicrous or utterly trivial. But while we pity their credulity, they are grieved at our infidelity, or shocked at our irreverence, and the frigid unconcern which we exhibit in witnessing the celebration of the most awful mysteries of their faith.

These considerations should teach us to judge of the Romish practices with all Christian candor and charity; they may also lead us to moderate our expectations of the very speedy overthrow of the system. It has such a tenacious hold of the senses and the imagination, the hopes and the fears of the people, that the process of extinguishing it, or of thoroughly reforming it, may be difficult and protracted.

1. The Roman Catholic system is not favorable to the industry and physical prosperity of a state. No comparison is more fair, none can be less easily set aside, than that which is often instituted between the principal Protestant and Catholic countries of Europe. The argument is open, and read of all men; it cannot be met, nor its force evaded. Protestantism is favorable to the temporal prosperity of nations; Roman Catholicism is not, or in proportion as it is, it departs from its spirit and usages.

The reasons of this contrast are perfectly obvious. The general influence of the Papacy in repressing freedom of thought, independence of opinion, the sense of personal responsibility, the motives to individual exertion, is not confined to the territory of morals and religion; it has extended over the entire physical life, all the departments of industry and action. If the members of a community are not allowed to think on questions affecting their spiritual interests, they will be apt to be sluggish and thriftless in all which pertains to their temporal well-being.

Again, through its innumerable festivals and holiday observances, Romanism essentially interferes with habits of industry and the regular business of life. The command, "Six days shalt thou labor," is interpreted to mean, "Three or four days shalt thou labor; all the rest shall be fasts or holidays." The number of canonized saints on its calendar is eleven hundred and twenty-eight,* the annual festivals of multitudes of whom are celebrated by the Church universal, or by large portions of it. The checks upon industry, and the habits of idleness arising from this source,

---

* *Catalogue Alphabetique des Saints et Saintes, avec la Date de leur Mort et de leurs Fêtes, Annuaire Historique*, Paris, 1847.

where the fasts and festivals are observed with any degree of strictness, are innumerable.

Besides, the number of ecclesiastics, who pursue no useful occupation, and who are not needed for any spiritual purpose, is enormously great. The city of Rome, with a population of 175,000, has more than three hundred churches and one ecclesiastic to every thirty of its population.* The kingdom of Naples, not including Sicily, with a population of about six millions, has nearly one hundred thousand priests and persons belonging to the religious orders. The barren island of Sardinia is furnished with one hundred and seventeen convents.

Idleness, rather than positive immorality, is the charge which is most commonly laid at the door of the priesthood in the city of Rome. They are promenading the streets, lounging at the museums and picture galleries, and are not occupied in their appropriate calling. The Roman Catholic Church is the mother of idleness as well as of ignorance. The great mass of the population in many parts of Italy are indescribably poor; the property is in the hands of the bankers and of a few other rich men. The vast Campagna near Rome, the immense Pontine marshes lining the Appian Way towards Naples, impregnated with disease and death, would become within two years, in the hands of an Englishman or New-Englander, the garden of the world.†

---

* The city of Rome, according to the official census, reported in the Augsburg *Allgem. Zeit.*, 1847, had 54 parishes, 27,532 families, 39 bishops, 1,514 priests, 2,471 monks, 1,754 nuns, 521 seminaries, and a population of 175,883. Naples, with a population of 360,000, has 300 churches.

† In 1797, when the Papal government was overturned by the French, the Board of Public Subsistence exhibited a deficit of 3,293,000 crowns, incurred in retailing bread to the people.

So far as industry and the true principles of political economy take root in a Roman Catholic country, it is by a departure, and only by a departure, from the spirit of the system.*

2. The Catholic system is preëminently a materializing system. It measures spiritual truth, to a great extent, according to a gross and earthly standard. It clothes pure and elevated ideas in a garb foreign to their nature, or connects with them mean and repulsive associations. Instead of raising mortals to the skies, it robs angels of their spiritual glory. The sublime and dreadful mysteries of the invisible world, into which the seraphim would fear to intrude, are opened to the vulgar gaze, and are made so definite and mensurable and earthlike, as to lose their legitimate influence and become nearly transformed into material substances.

Proofs and illustrations of these remarks might be accumulated almost without end. After the communicant

* We learned the following facts at Naples, in 1847, on the best authority. The government at that time had a complete monopoly of tobacco, salt, playing-cards, and snow. The last article is considered indispensable. Salt was $ 2.50 a bushel. The land-tax was sometimes enormously high, amounting to one fourth of a man's income. But it was very unequal, as a small bribe would induce the assessors to lay a light tax on one, while that laid upon another who happened to be absent, or who would not pay the bribe, was ruinous. The country enjoys one of the finest climates and has a most fertile soil, yet there is little general prosperity and little foreign commerce. The state of morals in the city is deplorably low. Pimps abound in the streets, who solicit passengers and strangers to criminal indulgence. According to the testimony of Dr. Cox, an English physician, one fourth of the diseases of males at Naples are either dependent on or complicated with diseases caused by dissipation. Contentions and quarrels frequently occur among different priests and parishes.

makes the sign of the cross at the sacrament, he says, "May the body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve my soul to eternal life," * — his body really, truly, and substantially. When the last notes of the Sanctus have died upon the ear, a small bell tinkles, and our Lord is physically present on the altar, under the emblems, — his literal body and blood are partaken of, — a physical, materializing interpretation of Scripture, which is only a specimen of a system which is applied to a large part of the entire volume.

Some of the numerous rules laid down in the Roman Missal for the taking of the sacrament, are disgustingly minute, surrounding a spiritual truth with the most familiar and degrading images. Some of the articles are not fit for quotation. "If any one does not fast after midnight," the rubric prescribes, "even after the taking of water only, or of any other drink or food, even in the shape of medicine, and in whatsoever minute quantity, he cannot communicate or celebrate. If the residue of the food remaining in the mouth be swallowed, the residuary particles do not prevent communion, since they are not swallowed after the manner of food. The same is to be said, if, in washing the face, a drop of water should be swallowed, contrary to the intention."

So the doctrines of repentance and the forgiveness of sins are miserably degraded by the penances and indulgences of the Romish system, even if we admit the most plausible explanations of the Catholic theologians. The intercourse of the soul of man with its Maker, in its most solemn moments, in the deciding crises of its destiny, is tampered with by the arts of a mercenary traffic. Temporal

* Bishop England's Explanation of the Construction, etc. of a Church, Rome, 1845, p. 144.

rewards and punishments, if not eternal, are made a marketable commodity.

Over the gateway of many churches in Rome is to be seen posted up the words: "Indulgentia plenaria, perpetua et quotidiana, pro vivis et defunctis." Sometimes the sentence is on a marble slab in the church; sometimes it is a written, framed tablet of parchment, hanging upon a column; sometimes it is in gilt letters on a metal plate; at others, on a loose printed paper. On the inner wall of the church of St. Sebastian, which stands without the walls on the Appian Way, is a marble inscription which declares that "whosoever shall have entered it [i. e. the catacomb] shall obtain plenary remission of all his sins, through the merits of the one hundred and seventy-four thousand holy martyrs, and of forty-six high pontiffs, likewise martyrs," who were interred there. "So many are the indulgences of the Lateran church," it is declared, "that they cannot in any wise be numbered but by God alone." *

* The following are taken from various churches in Rome. In St. Luigi dei Francesci, "Whoever prays for the king of France has ten days of indulgence," by Pope Innocent IV. In St. Pietro in Carcere, "S. Sylvester granted every day to those who visited it 1,200 years of indulgence, doubled on Sundays and commanded festivals, and besides, every day the remission of a third part of sins." In St. Cosmo and Damian, "Gregory I. granted to all and each one visiting this church of St. Cosmo and Damian 1,000 years of indulgence, and on the day of the station of the same church, the same Gregory granted 10,000 years of indulgence." On a marble slab near the door of the church of St. Saviour di Thermis is the following: "Indulgences conceded in perpetuity by high pontiffs in this church. Every day of the year there are 1,230 years of indulgence; for all Lent there is plenary indulgence; for the pilgrims there is every day plenary indulgence." — *Romanism as it exists in Rome*, by the Hon. J. W. Percy, pp. 48 – 53.

The great facts of our future, spiritual existence, so simple and sublime, so incapable of being symbolized by the gross objects of sense, are robbed, in the sermons of the Italian preachers, of their true efficiency, and made to assume the most grotesque, or repulsive, material forms. The Paradise and Gehenna of the Moslems, the Elysium and the Hades of Virgil, might find exact counterparts in the discourses of many professed Christian preachers.

Three or four years ago an eloquent Italian friar preached in Rome. His subject was the Last Judgment. And he handled it in a manner to terrify the poor audience to the utmost degree, using every art his imagination could suggest. Sometimes he threw a veil over the Madonna's face, or turned her round, for she moved on a pivot, and exhibited her back to his audience in token of alienation of feeling; sometimes he shook her garments, which were black, allusive to the train of thought in which he was indulging; he then produced an iron chain and scourged himself violently with it, the harsh clank of which against the panels of the pulpit, united with the heavy sounds of the ropes with which some of his hearers were lacerating themselves, together with the sobs and shrieks of the females, were terrifying to the firmest nerves.

On the following evening, his subject was Hell. It might have been Omniscience itself that was speaking, so intimate was the knowledge displayed of the secrets of that unknown world. Towards the end of the discourse, he called for a lighted pitch torch, which was in waiting, and, deliberately rolling up his sleeve, held his wrist immediately over the flame. Such was the torment, he said, to which every member of the sinner's body would be subjected through all eternity. There was no flinching on the part of the

friar, so strongly were his nerves strung; nor was there any deception.*

Now this method of exhibiting truth was extraordinary only in degree. It habitually appeals to the inferior part of our nature. It seeks to reduce every proposition to sensible proof. It likes to trust in nothing which cannot be seen and weighed and measured. In short, its tendency is to supersede the use of the reason by reducing the highest and most spiritual truths to the level of the outward sense.

3. One of the most striking forms under which Italian Catholicism appears is that of a baptized Paganism. It is an extraordinary mixture of Roman polytheism and Christianity. The stranger at Rome can at times with difficulty recollect whether he is walking in the streets of Augustus's Rome or in those of Pius the Ninth. He turns a corner and passes out of Jesus Street and enters Minerva Street. He gazes upon Vespasian's amphitheatre, and then listens to a friar preaching in the centre of it. Looking at the inscriptions on the churches, he reads, "Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Santa Maria in Lucina, Santo Apollinare, Santo Martino." The saints Cosmo and Damiano are worshipped where there was a temple of Romulus and Remus. A noble building, at this moment nearly perfect, dedicated to Antoninus and his wife Faustina, is now the church of St. Lorenzo. One descends out of a church into the Mammertine prison where Catiline's fellow-conspirators were confined. The ancient Romans had a great number of local gods, who presided over particular places or occupations. St. Martin is now the protector of the millers. St. Luke is the patron of sculptors, painters, and architects. A likeness of the Madonna, painted by him, says the Roman almanac, ex-

* Rome Pagan and Papal, 1846, p. 244.

ists in the church of Santa Maria Maggiore. St. Erasmus is the advocate against spasmodic sufferings, St. Rocco against plagues, St. Bonosa against the small-pox, and St. Martha against epidemic diseases.* People take their feeble children to the church of St. Theodore, at the foot of the Palatine hill, where the Roman matrons formerly dedicated their children to Romulus. On a certain day the cardinals are seen sweeping up the nave of St. Peter's, in their scarlet robes, in order to kiss the bronze statue of the Apostle, which, it is said, was once dedicated to the worship of Jupiter Capitolinus. No Roman Catholic will pass it without going through the ceremony. Three of the toe-nails of the right foot are worn away. Cicero, describing a statue, says that its mouth and chin were somewhat worn, because the people in their prayers and thanksgivings were accustomed, not only to worship it, but to kiss it. On the left side of the church of St. Mary, on the Capitoline hill, are exposed, at Christmas, two images of Augustus and the Cumæan Sibyl, respectively, in memory of the popular tradition, that the Sibyl predicted the birth of our Saviour, and that Augustus therefore erected an altar to her memory. Particular churches in Rome are filled with votive offerings, from penitent criminals, or from those who have escaped various dangers. The ancient mariner vowed to Castor and Pollux, or to Neptune; the shepherd dedicated his pipe to Pan; the poet vowed to Apollo; and the successful general to Jupiter Feretrius.

Nothing is more striking than a Roman Catholic funeral, especially when it occurs about midnight. The body, placed on a bier, is borne on men's shoulders, with the face exposed. Two files of hooded monks chant the offices for

* Rome Pagan and Papal, 1846, p. 24.

the dead in a low and melancholy tone, each bearing a gleaming torch. The exact counterpart of this might have been witnessed in Rome two thousand years ago. The Pagan brought an animal or the fruits of the earth as an offering on the altar. He performed a lustration with water and incense. He supplicated Vesta and Janus with grain and wine. The Christian brings a composition, which to the senses appears to be nothing but flour and water, but which, as he asserts, is the very body of the Lord Jesus.

Christmas is the Saturnalia of the Romans; New Year's day too was a day of great account in ancient Rome, and it is equally so in modern Rome. The Carnival is a representation, in innumerable particulars, of the Saturnalia and the Bacchanalian Lupercalia of the ancients.*

* The Carnival commences on Saturday and continues eleven days, excepting the two Sabbaths and Friday. A long and straight street — the Corso — is filled with masked persons, soldiers, horses and carriages, slowly passing in two lines and then returning. The maskers are decked in all kinds of fantastic garments, women's clothes, horns on their heads, tails sticking out of their bodies, occasionally pretending to drink out of empty bottles in their hands, reeling as if intoxicated, etc. In each of the carriages are from two to eight or ten persons, largely provided with flowers tied together in knots, and with little balls made of lime in the form of sugar-plums. These flowers and balls are thrown with great vigor into the balconies and windows of the houses, or into the faces of those who are in the streets, and are returned in large measure from every direction. In some cases, half-pints or pints of these plums are poured down in rapid succession upon the heads and faces of persons passing. This most grotesque scene, in which the whole population of the Eternal City seems to be engaged, is finally closed by the racing through the street of five or six poor horses, without riders, urged on by the shouts of the people, and by little goads or nails, fastened to tin plates which they wear.

In defence of this identification of the customs and usages of Pagan and Christian Rome, the Catholic maintains that the demon has been exorcised, the polytheistic rite has been sanctified, and that the vicegerent of the Almighty has laid his holy hands on the heathenish symbol and converted it into an instrument of God's glory. Christianity has thus obtained a visible and tangible victory over the ancient faith, more impressive than if the objects of this idolatry had been all extirpated.

But this confident advocate forgets that a law of the human mind is stronger than a decree of the Pope ; that none of his blessings or imprecations can annul or disturb the association of ideas. The imperial statue, the pagan rite, how many times soever the holy chrism has been poured upon them, will suggest the forbidden idolatry, may invite to a repetition of the unholy act.

This perpetuation of the old polytheism, this amalgamation of the rites of idolatry and of the Christian faith, constitutes one of the weakest points of the Romish system. It is a crude mixture, a heterogeneous conglomeration of particles which have no affinity. Pure Christianity indignantly spurns the compromise, disclaims all this attempted fusion of contrary elements, and will stand, if at all, on its independent simplicity.

4. Again, the Roman Catholic system, in some of its aspects, is preëminently childish and unreasonable. If its most earnest efforts had been directed to dissociate the understanding and faith, to separate belief from common sense, it could hardly have succeeded more perfectly. The tax which it practically lays on the credulity of human nature is almost incredible. This childish superstition would not be extraordinary if it were confined to the unreasoning and

illiterate multitude, or if it were exclusively seen in retired villages or secluded country churches. Our commiseration would in that case be excited for the dupes of these wretched delusions. But when the most renowned churches of the metropolis of the world are the selected scenes of this jugglery, — when the Holy Father himself and his most enlightened servants give the sanction of their authority and presence, in the nineteenth century, to fables, to alleged miracles of the most ludicrous and lying character, — the pity ends in astonishment that a system with such elements could have survived a thousand years, in a country that claims to be the great source of civilization, and the central seat of the Christian faith.

On one of the days in January, 1847, the church of St. Andrea delle Fratte, near the College of the Propaganda, was filled repeatedly ; every individual of the throng, apparently, except a few foreigners, went up to the priest, successively, and kissed a bone, said once to have belonged to the patron saint of the church. Not a few of the *élite* of the city, as well as the poor peasantry, were there. Children of a few months old were brought in to touch the mysterious relic. Those who were particularly devout had the privilege of kissing the fragment twice or thrice.

On the Cœlian hill, just inside of the southern wall of Rome, stand two of the seven Basilican churches of Rome, St. John Lateran and the Holy Cross in Jerusalem. The view from the top of St. John Lateran has no equal in Rome, perhaps not on earth. There are but few modern buildings in the vicinity to mar the prospect. The ruins of old Rome rear their ivy-crowned summits, or crumble all around with a most melancholy impressiveness. On the west, beyond the Coliseum, the arch of Titus, and the Palatine, the Tiber

flows into the blue Mediterranean, both river and sea perfectly distinct. On the northwest is the Roman forum, bounded by the Tarpeian rock and the Capitoline. On the north and northeast is the modern city, crowned by that one imperial dome. Far beyond, the prospect is limited by the single mountain, — still in the winter, "alta stet nive candidum," the lyric poet's Soracte. On the east and southeast, bright in the sun's setting rays, are the Sabine hills, Tusculum, Prænestc, and other objects so famous in Latin story. On the south stretches away the undulating Campagna, traversed by the old aqueducts with their vast arches, and dotted by the mouldering fragments of a buried world. Here, if anywhere, it would seem, the churches should be built in all purity and simplicity, — the chosen seats of a worship befitting the locality, lifting the soul to Him who, while he sees mighty empires decaying beneath, is himself from everlasting to everlasting. Yet these two churches are the selected receptacles of superstition and impious fraud; of relics which are an insult to the human understanding, and which pour contempt on the great doctrine of the resurrection of the body.

On a tablet hanging to one of the columns of the tabernacle over the high altar in St. John Lateran, is a list of the relics which are there preserved. Some of them are as follows: Part of the arm of St. Helen, mother of Constantine; part of the bones of Salome, mother of John; a finger of St. Catharine of Siena; part of the brain of St. Vincent of Paul; the head of Zacharias, father of John the Baptist; the cup in which John the Apostle drank poison by command of Domitian; part of his garments, and of the chain with which he was bound when he came from Ephesus to Rome; part of the chin of John the Baptist; part of our

Lord's cradle at Bethlehem, and of the napkin with which he wiped his hands after the supper; one of the thorns of the crown; part of the sponge, and of the blood and water which flowed from his side. In this church is also the veritable table around which our Lord and his disciples reclined when the supper was instituted.

In the church of the Holy Cross, a few rods east, is a parchment list suspended on the wall on the right of the apsis. Here it will be decorous to quote only some items. Among them is the finger of St. Thomas, with which he touched the most holy side of our Lord, the same finger being preserved at four other churches; the altar of St. Helen, so holy that only the pontiff and one cardinal can celebrate there; a great part of the holy veil and of the hair of the Virgin; and one bottle of the most precious blood of our Lord.

In this church, also, are the stone on which the angel stood when he announced the incarnation; the stone where the Lord wrote the law on Mt. Sinai; some of the manna of the desert; part of the rod of Aaron which budded; and relics of eleven of the Hebrew prophets.*

Between these two churches, and near St. John Lateran, is a building of singular form, partly resembling a church and partly a house, with an open portico in front. Within this portico are three flights of steps. The middle flight — the Santa Scala — is that by which Jesus entered the palace of Pilate. The steps are made of marble, and covered with wood to guard against their further destruction. How they were brought there is a matter of devout conjecture. Sometimes more than two hundred persons are seen at a time

* See the complete lists of these relics in the churches; also in the common descriptions of Rome, e. g. Percy's Romanism, p. 82.

ascending upon their knees this middle flight. Protestants are permitted to walk up and down the other two, though these are thought to have imbibed a portion of sanctity. Under the Sacra Confessione in St. Peter's church, encircled by a beautiful balustrade, composed of marbles, and decorated with more than one hundred superb lamps continually burning, the mortal remains of the great apostle of the church repose. In the *Diario Romano*, for 1847, we read, "In the churches of Ara-Cœli, Francesco a Ripa, and others, is performed the function of the replacement of the Holy Infant, Jan. 6." This image was said to be miraculously painted a flesh color, and it is held in the highest veneration by the citizens of Rome.

The contradiction and absurdities into which this relic-worship leads, would be astounding were they found in any other connection than that of the Roman Catholic Church. It may not be inapposite to quote a few of the details.

The body of St. Andrew is worshipped at Constantinople, Amalfi, Toulouse, in Russia, at the convent of the apostles in Armenia, without reckoning a sixth head of the apostle, which may be kissed at Rome. The body of St. James is venerated at Compostella, Verona, Toulouse, Pistoie, and Rome, without mentioning a sixth head, which is carried in procession at Venice, and a seventh, which is preserved in the abbey of Arras in France. There are eight bodies of Luke, eighteen of Paul, and thirty of St. Pancratius, in as many different cities. Constantinople formerly claimed to have possession of St. Peter's body, except the head, which was left at Rome. His relics are venerated in the abbey of Claude in France and in the convent of Cluny at Arles. There is a finger in the monastery of the Three Churches in Armenia, a thumb at Toulouse, and three teeth

at Marseilles. The chair in St. Peter's church, in which that apostle exercised his office, is said to have been examined by the profane French soldiers when they had possession of Rome, who copied the inscription, namely: "There is but one God and Mohammed is his prophet." The chair was probably among the spoils of the Crusaders.

There is another account which seems to show that there have been at least two chairs exhibited, each as identically the chair which St. Peter used. On the 18th of January, 1688, when the chair was cleaning, in order to be set up in some conspicuous place in the Vatican, there unluckily appeared carved upon it the twelve labors of Hercules. Giacomo Bartolini, who was present at the discovery, affirms that their worship was not misplaced, since it was paid, not to the wood, but to the prince of the apostles. Another distinguished author attempted to explain the labors of Hercules in a mystical sense, namely, as emblematical of the future exploits of the Popes.*

5. The Roman Catholic system, particularly as it is seen in Italy, is throughout, in all its parts and in all its aspects, a religion of symbols, a system of types or sensible signs. The Romish ritual, the ceremonial, interminable in length, every part of a church, every article of the sacerdotal dress, every fringe on that dress, every provision which is made for man's spiritual nature from the cradle to the grave, in the most minute particulars, are significant, are crowded with a mystic importance. Myriads of instructors start up on every side, who will never allow the poor man to think an original thought, or step once out of the charmed circle.

* See Lady Morgan's Italy, and the Treatise by Dr. A. Sheler on the question, Was St. Peter ever at Rome? London, 1846, pp. 117, 118.

The crucifix is placed on the centre of the altar where the bloody immolation is to be made ; candles are lighted ; by their blaze exhibiting the descent of the Holy Spirit in the form of fiery tongues ; the altar must be of stone representing the rock of salvation ; the vestment must be white on the festival of those saints who, without shedding their blood, gave their testimony by the practice of exalted virtues ; red on the festivals of martyrs ; violet in times of penance ; green on those days when there is no special solemnity ; and black on Good Friday. In the alb of the priest, the beholders see the white robe in which the Saviour was clothed when he was sent back by Herod to Pilate. The cincture reminds the faithful of the cord which bound the innocent victim. The stole is significant of the manner in which the Saviour was fastened to the cross ; it forms a kind of yoke on the shoulders, reminding the wearer of Jesus, who can enable him to bear his cross. The handkerchief suggests to the congregation the cord by which the Lamb of God was bound to the pillar when he was scourged. Another vestment represents the seamless coat of Christ.*

Thus it is in innumerable particulars, in a thousand branches and ramifications of this cumbrous system. It does not address the reason, it speaks to the eye ; it does not lead to profound meditation, it kindles the fancy. It discourages all liberal inquiry, all manly investigation, all independent training.† It is founded on the assumption

---

* See Bishop England's Explanation, *passim*.

† " The Church requires of her children, that they shall conform their minds to that meaning which has been received in the beginning with the books themselves, from their inspired compilers ; and that they will never take and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of those fathers, who in every age have given to

that the human race is to be for ever in its childhood, always to be wrapped in its swaddling-bands, never to go beyond its elementary lessons, never to be disengaged from the hand of its teacher, never to come into the glorious freedom of the children of God. It is, in many of its aspects, Judaism carried out into detail, omitting that common sense and those lofty views which characterize the earlier Economy. Now the question is, Will the world, will Italy, always be in bondage to these beggarly elements? to the provisions of an introductory dispensation, now utterly barren and effete? The question needs only to be stated to be answered. As surely as civilization and knowledge increase, some of the most objectionable characteristics of the Romish system must be abandoned. The contrast between them and Christianity is as great as it is between the Mishna and the New Testament.

6. Again, the Roman Catholic system is based on the interpretation, or the misinterpretation, of a very few picked passages of the Bible. This is obvious, not only in her written Apologies, but upon and within her churches; in the inscriptions on her altars; in her monumental tablets for the dead; on her memorial crosses by the road-side, and wherever she has been able to affix her watchwords. The text declaring the supremacy of St. Peter, "Tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram ædificabo ecclesiam meam, et tibi dabo claves regni cœlorum," is written in colossal let-

---

us the uninterrupted testimony of this original signification. She knows of no principle of common sense, or of religion, upon which any individual could, after the lapse of centuries, assume to himself the prerogative of discovering the true meaning of any passage of the Bible to be different from that which is thus testified by the unanimous declaration of the great bulk of Christendom." — *Bishop England.*

ters of gold upon a purple ground within the dome of her metropolitan temple. The one passage in which auricular confession finds its authority, is rung upon by a thousand changes. One isolated passage, ever on the lips of the priest, is the invariable support of the mysterious transubstantiation. Indeed, it may be said to rest on the monosyllable. From a solitary declaration is derived the power of the priest to absolve the sinner. The perpetual virginity of Mary is inferred from half a verse, which by natural implication teaches the direct contrary. The celibacy of the clergy has its basis on a few passages which, according to the declarations of the inspired writers themselves, had only a local and temporary application. The doctrine of penances appeals to the mistranslation of a single Greek noun.

Now it is hardly necessary to say, that any system of religious doctrine or of church government, which can find no wider support, must ultimately fall. No Christian hierarchy can stand which shrinks from the examination of any portion of the Scriptures, or which puts forth its claims on the strength of a few passages which are severed from their context. It is the glory of Protestantism that it has no favorite chapters and verses. It stands or falls on the spirit of the entire volume, on the widest induction of particulars, on the consentaneous support of all the sacred writers, and of all which they declare. It pretends to no darling Apostle, to no artfully culled symbols; it shrinks from no argument, is afraid of no catechizing, never arrays faith against reason, and relies on that same broad, common-sense interpretation of the Bible, which our great jurist would apply to the constitution of his country.

7. We may infer, finally, the ultimate downfall or the essential reformation of the Roman Catholic system in Italy, from the character and history of the present pontiff.

When the historian Niebuhr was in Rome, about thirty years ago, he said that the Italians were a nation of walking dead men. It is so no longer. About two years since, there was a concerted night celebration of the former expulsion of the Austrians from Genoa. The mountain-tops, which no policemen could reach, were at one and the same moment in a blaze. These midnight fires, responding from summit to summit, were but a symbol of the fires that were burning in a nation's breast. It was the signal of the reunion, of the renationalizing of the Italian State. It had found in one name, as it thought, a binding watchword, in one man a living impersonation of its spirit. Pius the Ninth was not elected by accident. He did not owe his elevation to the intrigues of the French ambassador, or to a misapprehension of his character on the part of the conclave. He was elected because he had served in a civil employment before he became a priest; because he was a native of the liberal, the Adriatic side of the Peninsula; because men had confidence in his frank, open, and good face; in short, because he was the antipodes of that aged bigot, Gregory XVI.* Pius the Ninth was chosen because he would open the prison-doors and let the captive go free; because it was hoped that he would do that which had so often, and in so many places, been attempted in vain, for which torrents of patriot blood had been shed, for which Austrian dungeons had been filled and thousands of exiles had wandered in distant lands. His election was a necessity of the times, to which a thousand influences had been for many

* It is said that this Pope punished capitally in sixteen years, in a population of less than three millions, three hundred persons, and incarcerated, mostly for political offences, not less than thirty thousand.

years converging. A second Gregory could not have worn the mitre six months. No college of cardinals, or fortress of St. Angelo, or inherited sanctity, could have saved him. The Roman States would have had a liberal Pope, or the chair of St. Peter would have been left vacant.

What are, and what probably will be, the consequences of his elevation, or what change will be effected, either under his guidance, or in opposition to his will ?

First, the idea of the Pope's infallibility as a temporal or a spiritual prince has been rudely assailed, and can with difficulty ever regain its ascendency. The absurdity of it is subjected to constant and most humiliating tests. So doubtful has it become, so ill fitted is it to meet the sudden emergencies of the present times, so extensively is its inefficiency known and canvassed, that its former strenuous advocates, as it should seem, must abandon it.

Secondly, the adoption of those civil and municipal reforms in the States of the Church, and throughout Italy, which are most urgently needed. The days of misgovernment, of legalized oppression, of exclusive aristocratic pretension, and of a wretched serfdom, converting some of the fairest districts in the world into a desert, are fast passing away. Rome, if she would retain a tithe of her power, must practise the lessons of industry and a wise economy.

Thirdly, the separation of the civil and ecclesiastical power. This is virtually effected already. The Pope at the present moment is an ecclesiastical sovereign, and no more. It is not the cardinal legate who governs Bologna; it is the citizens themselves. It is not the Pope who sends his troops into Lombardy, or who disbands the Swiss guard, or exiles the Company of Jesus; it is public opinion, acting through laymen at Rome. The country of Brutus and

Cicero and Rienzi, which, three years ago, was a despotism as absolute as any which existed on earth, is now virtually a republic.

Fourthly, the immediate introduction, to some extent, of Protestant opinions, of free discussion on matters of religion, and of an unrestricted press. The light has hitherto been systematically shut out. For ages an embargo has been laid on every thing which would disturb the Catholic belief. The ports and custom-houses of Italy have sought to exclude Protestant opinions, as zealously as they would the infection of the plague.* But this peremptory exclusion, it is to be hoped, is at an end. The *Index Expurgatorius* will, probably, be hereafter nothing but an historical curiosity on the shelves of the Vatican. Even should the hopes of the friends of civil liberty be disappointed, and the Austrian supremacy be again restored in Lombardy, still it would be difficult, if not impracticable, to reinstate the old system of Papal exclusiveness. Vienna herself feels the quickening breath of freedom. This beautiful land, there is good reason to believe, will not again become the theatre of Jesuit intrigue and of inquisitorial cruelty. Whether monarchy, in a limited form, again obtain the ascendency or not, the cause of Protestant liberty has received an accession of strength which must ere long sweep away all obstacles.

---

* Three or four years ago, a gentleman found it impossible to procure a Bible in the vernacular tongue at any of the book-shops in Rome. In 1846 – 7, no copy of an Italian Bible could be found for sale in several of the largest cities of the country, except that of Martini, which is in several volumes octavo. Now it is stated in the public prints, that parts of the Bible, the Westminster Assembly's Catechism, and extracts from the writings of Vinet and of other Protestants, are translated into Italian and freely distributed.

Fifthly, we may also hope that some of the more objectionable and comparatively modern features of the Roman Catholic system will be abandoned. An economical or civil reformation must modify, in a variety of ways, some of the practices and doctrines of the Papacy. Certain usages and articles of belief cannot endure the ordeal which emancipated reason, popular education, or an enfranchised Bible would of necessity establish. The right of private judgment in matters of religious belief always accompanies the diffusion of the Scriptures, and must with the blessing of Heaven essentially reform, if it does not gradually destroy, the Catholic hierarchy.

The degree of freedom which the Vaudois, who dwell in the mountains of Piedmont, after ages of persecution, now enjoy, and which has made a hundred Alpine valleys break forth into singing, is but an earnest, we trust, of that perfect liberty in Christ, which shall ere long prevail from sea to sea, and from the Lombard Plain to the utmost South. Then it will be, indeed, fair Italy, — sublime and graceful in outward nature, with the larger air, the purple light, and a sun sinking into the sea with a lustre peculiarly his own, full of old reminiscences that stir the soul to its depths, the parent of freedom, the home of art, the nurse of genius in its noblest forms, the guardian of those whose "dust is immortality," where sleeps on Ravenna's shore one who spake of "things invisible to mortal eye," where was revealed to another all deathless ideals of beauty, where apostles and martyrs still repose united to Jesus, where Ambrose sung, and Augustine saw the vision of the city of God, whose very soil is instinct with thought, whose "ashes are yet warm," — how fair she will be, when there are no sad contrasts in her moral

and religious state, when the spirit that once evangelized the Eternal City shall again pervade her plastic, susceptible, and most interesting people, when, from all her vine-crowned hills and delicious valleys, the ransomed of the Lord shall return and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy!

SLAVERY IN ANCIENT GREECE.*

THERE has not been any attempt, within our knowledge, to investigate thoroughly the condition of Grecian Slavery.† The ancient historian, for the most part, concerned himself only with the freeborn citizen. He had in general no sympathies to expend in behalf of the great prostrate multitude, who toiled and died unseen. We have allusions, incidental notices, paragraphs scattered here and there in the long records from Hesiod down to the historians of Byzantium. The thoughtful tragedian sometimes drops a tear for the poor slave, and the comic poet raises a laugh at his expense, but no Xenophon was found to lift the curtain and detail the features of that system, which deprived at least two thirds of the population of Greece of all political importance, and, in a great measure, of happiness itself. In the following pages we propose to collect and embody such facts and

* This Essay was published in the Biblical Repository for January, 1835, and was afterwards republished in Great Britain.

† The German work of Reitemeier excepted, which we have not been able to procure. So far as we know, he is the only author who has written formally on the subject.

notices as a somewhat patient examination of Greek writers has brought to our knowledge.

Greece, in its early days, was in a state of perpetual piratical warfare. Cattle, as the great means of subsistence, were first the object of plunder. Then, as the inhabitants, by degrees, engaged in agricultural pursuits, men, women, and children were sought for slaves. A sea, which has innumerable islands and ports, offered powerful incentives to piracy. Perhaps the conduct of the Phœnicians towards the uncivilized nations, among whom the desire of gain led them, was not always the most upright or humane. Hostilities would naturally ensue ; and hence might first arise the estimation of piracy, which was a fruitful source of slavery, and long prevailed among the Greeks as an honorable practice.

From the general account of the polity of the island of Crete, furnished by Plato and Aristotle, we find that Minos established his system upon two principles ; that freemen should be all equal ; and that they should be served by slaves. The soil was cultivated by the slaves on the public account ; the freemen ate together at the public tables, and their families were subsisted from the public stock. While a comparatively small society lived in freedom and honorable leisure, a much larger portion of the human race was, for their sakes, doomed to rigid and irredeemable slavery. In the same manner, without doubt, the early inhabitants of Sicyon, Corinth, Argos, and other cities, were unhappily divided.

In Homer, we find many allusions to manners and customs growing out of a state of slavery. " These are the evils," we are told in the Iliad, " that follow the capture of a town : the men are killed ; the city is burned to the ground ; the women and children of all ranks are carried

off for slaves."* "Wretch that I am!" says Priam, "what evil does the great Jupiter bring on me in my old age! My sons slain, my daughters dragged into slavery; violence pervading even the chambers of my palace; and the very infants dashed against the ground in horrid sport of war."† In the Odyssey, we discover many allusions to the institution of slavery. The directions which Penelope's housekeeper gives are as follows: "Go quickly! some of you sweep the house and sprinkle it, and let the crimson carpets be spread on the seats; let others rub well the tables with sponges, and wash carefully the bowls and cups. Some of you go instantly to the fountain for water."‡ No less than twenty went on this errand. The whole number of maid-servants was fifty; not all, however, employed in household business; for we find fifty also forming the establishment of Alcinoüs; of whom some, says the poet, ground at the mill, and some turned the spindle or threw the shuttle. Men-servants waited at meals; and those of Ulysses's household are described as comely youths, well clothed, and always neat in their appearance. Servants of both sexes seem to have been all slaves. It was praise, equally for a slave and a princess, to be skilful in the business of spinning, needle-work, and the loom. The princess Nausicaa, the beautiful daughter of the king of Phæacia, went with the female slaves, in a carriage drawn by mules, to a fountain, in a sequestered spot, at some distance from the city, to wash the clothes of the family.

In estimating the happiness of the heroic ages, we must take into account its extreme instability, arising in part

* Τέκνα δέ τ' ἄλλοι ἄγουσι, βαθυζώνους τε γυναῖκας. Il. IX. 594.

† ——— ἑλκηθείσας τε θύγατρας. Il. XXII. 62.

‡ Odyssey, XX. 149.

from the institution of slavery. Hence there is a melancholy tinge widely diffused over the poems of Homer.* He frequently adverts, in general terms, to the miseries of mankind. That earth nourishes no animal more wretched than man, is a remark which he puts into the mouth of Jove himself. His common epithet for war is "tearful" (δακρυόεις). He seems to have had some knowledge, by tradition or otherwise, of a period when slavery did not exist; an idea to which Herodotus alludes, and Plutarch also in his Life of Numa.

Though there were many slaves in the days of Homer, yet their number was afterwards greatly increased. At one time, in Argos, they assumed the reins of government, and executed all the affairs of State, till the sons of those who had been slain, arriving at adult age, obtained possession, and expelled the slaves. The latter retired to the fortress Tyrinthe, which they had seized. A serious war followed. After suffering severe losses, the Argians were finally victorious.† The Ionian colonies on the coast of Asia Minor were supposed to furnish remarkably fine slaves. Atossa, queen of Darius, urged that monarch to make war on the Greeks, in order that she might have some Ionian female slaves. When the inhabitants of Coos, says Athenæus, sacrificed to the gods, they allowed no slaves to be present.‡ In the early history of Macedonia, we find that great vassals of the crown held extensive lordships in the inland country, with a princely authority; bearing evident analogy, in office and dignity, to the barons of Europe in the Middle Ages. In later times, also, the Macedonian constitution appears to have borne a near resemblance to that

* See Odyssey, IV. 93; VIII. 523; XI. 621; XVIII. 129.

† Herodotus, Erato, 83.

‡ Athenæus, Bâle ed. 1535, p. 131.

of the European kingdoms in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, when the combined civil and military powers were divided among lordships, dukedoms, earldoms, and baronies. Lordships and townships together acknowledged the sovereignty of one king; especially his right to command their service in arms for the common defence. Slaves existed among them, but less numerous than in the republics, and in a more mitigated condition. The people of all ranks above slavery, in cities and throughout the country, held the important right of judgment on life and death, and of bearing arms for common defence against foreign and domestic disturbers of the common peace.*

In Thessaly, the Penests, so called from their poverty, (*πένης, πενέστης*), were the descendants of the people of the neighboring countries, conquered and enslaved by the Thessalians, and were frequently formidable to the government. They were most commonly occupied in cultivating the lands of their severe masters. In their employments, numbers, and continual disposition to revolt, they agreed with the Lacedæmonian Helots.† They first revolted in the wars of the Thessalians with the Achæans, Perrhæbians, and Magnesians. Aristotle mentions, that the island of Ægina, at one time, contained 470,000 slaves. This statement seems to be correct, though it has been called in question by Hume. A learned German, C. O. Müller, has accurately determined the area of Ægina, from Gell's map of Argolis, and made it 42 square miles English; thus increasing the possibility of a large slave population, especially if we assume, as is probable, that Ægina, in early times, had pos-

* Mitford's Greece, Vol. VII. p. 191.

† Aristotle's Pol., b. II.; Athenæus, 6. 18; Eurip. Herac. 639; Gillies's Greece, Vol. I.

sessions on the coast of Argolis. The naval dominion of the island, and its powerful assistance to others, are incompatible with a small population. Slaves never occupied much room. Ægina received supplies from the countries on the Black Sea, as well as the Peloponnesus, and particularly from Corinth.*

Timæus asserts, that Corinth had 460,000 slaves, in early times, before Athens had obtained possession of the commerce of Greece and the sovereignty of the seas. That the Corinthians kept a very large number of slaves, is proved by the expression *chœnix-measurers*, by which they were distinguished.†

There are different accounts of the origin of the Helots at Sparta, who were distinguished from other slaves by name, as well as condition. The common opinion is, that Helos, (whether an Arcadian town, or a rebellious dependency of Lacedæmon, is not agreed,) being taken by Soüs, son of Procles, king of Sparta, the inhabitants were, according to the practice of the times, reduced to slavery, and dispersed in such numbers over Laconia, that the name of Helot prevailed in that country as synonymous with slave. It appears probable, however, that the Lacedæmonians, as well as all the Peloponnesian Dorians, had slaves of Grecian race, before the reign of Soüs ; and we know that, after it, they reduced numbers of Greeks to that miserable state. But the institutions of Lycurgus must necessarily have occasioned a considerable alteration in the condition of Lacedæmonian slaves. For as husbandry and all mechanical arts were to be exercised by them alone,

* See Augustus Boeckh's Public Economy of Athens, 1828. Vol. I. p. 55.

† Χοινικομέτραι. A χοῖνιξ held somewhat more than a half-gallon.

their consequence in the State was considerably increased; but as private property was nearly annihilated, every slave became, in a great degree, the slave of every freeman. In proportion as their consequence increased, it became necessary to look upon them with a more jealous eye; and thus every Helot was watched by thousands of jealous masters.* The cruelty of the Lacedæmonians towards the Helots is frequently alluded to by many authors; though Plutarch, who was a great admirer of the Spartans, endeavors (inconclusively) to palliate it. These poor wretches were marked out for slaves in their dress, their gestures, in short, in every thing. They wore dog-skin bonnets and sheep-skin vests; they were forbidden to learn any liberal art, or to perform any act worthy of their masters. Once a day they received a certain number of stripes, for fear they should forget they were slaves. To crown all, they were liable to the horrible *cryptia* (κρυπτεία), *ambuscade*. The governors of the Spartan youthful freemen ordered the shrewdest of them, from time to time, to disperse themselves in the country, furnished only with daggers and some necessary provisions. In the day-time they hid themselves, rested in the most private places they could find, but at night they sallied out into the roads and killed all the Helots they could find. Sometimes, by day, they fell upon them in the fields, and murdered the ablest and strongest of them. Thucydides, in his history of the Peloponnesian war, relates, that the Spartans selected such of the Helots as were remarkable for their courage, to the number of two thousand or more, declared them free, crowned them with garlands, and conducted them to the temples of the gods; but, soon after, they all disappeared, and no one could, either then or since, give

* Mitford, Vol. I. p. 279.

account in what way they were destroyed. Aristotle says, that the Ephori, as soon as they were invested with their office, declared war against the Helots, that they might be massacred under pretence of law. In other respects they treated them with great inhumanity; sometimes they made them drink till they were intoxicated, and in that condition led them into the public halls, to show the young men what drunkenness was. They ordered them to sing mean and disgraceful songs, and to engage in ridiculous dances, but not to intermeddle with any thing graceful or honorable. When the Thebans invaded Laconia, and took a great number of Helots prisoners, they ordered them to sing the odes of Alcmon, Terpander, and others; but the Helots excused themselves, alleging that it was forbidden by their masters.* Plutarch endeavors to prove that the cruelty practised upon the Helots was not introduced by Lycurgus. He thinks that the *ambuscade*, particularly, had its origin in the fact that the Helots joined with the Messenians, after a terrible earthquake, which happened about 467 B. C., whereby a great part of Lacedæmon was overthrown, and in which above twenty thousand Spartans perished. But Ælian affirms expressly, that it was the common opinion in Greece, that this very earthquake was a judgment from heaven upon the Spartans for treating these Helots with such inhumanity.† The truth is, that the institutions of Lycurgus made slavery indispensable. The passion for military glory was universal. Sparta was one great camp. One of the principal curses (privileges, says Plutarch) which Lycurgus procured for his countrymen, was the enjoyment of leisure, the consequence of his forbidding them to exercise any mechanical trade. The Helots tilled the ground, and were answerable

* Plutarch, Life of Lycurgus. † Ælian, Hist. Varior. 3.

for its produce. Lycurgus introduced an unnatural state of society, and slavery was one of its products. He had a model, however, in the institutions of Crete, Egypt, and other countries, where military men generally belonged to the nobility, and were a distinct order from the husbandmen, mechanics, &c. The actual number of the Helots was not far, we believe, from four hundred thousand. That it was large, and at times very formidable, is the unanimous testimony. Their ranks, though constantly thinned by war and the horrible cruelties of their masters, were frequently replenished by the subjection of new tribes. By the conquest of Messene, a large number of wretched captives were forced into the condition of Helots.

Of the slavery which existed in Attica and Athens, we have more definite information. According to the accurate map of Barbié du Bocage, which is attached to the Travels of Anacharsis, the area of Attica, with the two islands, Salamis and Helena, amounts to about 874 square miles. Xenophon says, that the Athenians were equal in number to all the Bœotians, that is, the citizens of the one country to the citizens of the other. The whole population of Attica would be known, if we could separately ascertain the number of the citizens, resident aliens, and slaves, together with their wives and children. On an occasion of a distribution of corn, which, like all other distributions, was made according to the register of the adult citizens of eighteen years of age and upwards, a scrutiny was instituted in the archonship of Lysimachides, Olymp. 83. 4, into the genuineness of their birth (*γνησιότης*). There were then found, according to Philochorus, only 14,240 genuine citizens; and 4,760, who had assumed the rights of citizens unjustly, were in consequence sold as slaves. Previously, therefore, there

were 19,000 persons, who passed for citizens. After the breaking out of the Peloponnesian war, besides 13,000 heavy-armed infantry (ὁπλίται) there were also 16,000 others in Athens, who consisted of the oldest and youngest citizens and a certain number of resident aliens; the number of citizens must therefore at that time have been higher. An enumeration of the people was effected by Demetrius Phalereus, when Archon at Athens in Olymp. 117. 4, and yielded, according to Ctesicles, 21,000 citizens, 10,000 resident aliens, and 400,000 slaves. From this very important statement, the whole population of Attica has been variously estimated. According to the usual rule of statistics, the adults have been generally taken as a fourth part of the population. This would give for the citizens 84,000, the aliens 40,000, and the slaves 400,000. Sainte Croix erroneously adds 100,000 children to the number of slaves; they were doubtless reckoned in the 400,000. With regard to the total number of slaves, it is stated too much in round numbers to be entitled to perfect confidence. It will be sufficient to reckon 365,000 slaves, including women and children; and the whole population at 500,000; of whom the larger proportion were men, since fewer female than male slaves were kept, and not all the slaves, by any means, were married.

The proportion of the free inhabitants to the slaves can consequently be taken as 27 to 100, or nearly as one to four. In some of the American sugar plantations it has been as one to six. This number of slaves cannot appear too large, if the political circumstances of Attica are taken into consideration. Even the poorer citizens used to have a slave for the care of their household affairs.* In every

* See the beginning of the Plutus of Aristophanes.

moderate establishment many were employed for all possible occupations, such as grinders, bakers, cooks, tailors, errand-boys, or to accompany the master and mistress, who seldom went out without an attendant. Any one who was extravagant, and wished to attract attention, took perhaps three attendants with him.* We even hear of philosophers, who kept ten slaves. They were also let out as hired servants; they performed all the labor connected with the care of cattle and agriculture; they were employed in the working of mines and furnaces; all manual labor and the lower branches of trade were in a great measure carried on by them; large gangs labored in the numerous workshops for which Athens was celebrated; and a considerable number were employed in the merchant vessels and the fleet. Not to enumerate many instances of persons who had a smaller number of slaves, Timarchus kept in his workshop eleven or twelve; † Demosthenes's father, 52 or 53, besides the female slaves in his house; Lysias and Polemarchus, 120.‡ Plato expressly remarks, that the free inhabitants had frequently 50 slaves, and the rich even more.§ Philemonides had 300, Hipponicus 600, Nicias 1,000 slaves in the mines alone.‖ Suidas on the word *ἀπεψηφίσατο* mentions, that the slaves employed in the silver mines alone, and in country labor, amounted to 150,000. But Hume raises an objection on this number out of Xenophon. Xenophon proposed to the State to buy public slaves for the mines, and particularly mentions how large a revenue the State would receive from them, if it had 10,000 to begin with, remarking at the same time: "That the mines are able to

* Demosthenes, Oratio pro Phorm.
† Æschin. in Timarch.
‡ Demosthenes in Aphob.
§ Plato, De Republica, IX.
‖ Xenophon, De Vectigal.

receive many times this number, every body will allow, who remembers how much the slave-duty produced before the occurrences at Decelea." From this statement Hume infers, that the number cannot have been so large; for the diminution by the war of Decelea only amounted to 20,000,* and the increase of 10,000 does not stand in any considerable proportion to so large a number as 400,000. It must, however, be considered, that after the war of Decelea the Athenians probably ceased to keep so many slaves, on account of the facility of escape, and that a still greater number than ran away may have been dismissed. Xenophon himself proves that the mines, of which he has been speaking, could have afforded employment to many times 10,000.†

In what manner this population of 500,000 souls, in Attica, was distributed, cannot now be accurately known. Athens itself contained above 10,000 houses. There were, besides, lodging houses, inhabited by several families; and manufactories contained many hundreds of slaves. If 180,000 are reckoned for the city and harbors, and 20,000 for the mines, there then remain 300,000 souls for the other 608 square miles in Attica; which gives something less than 493½ to a square mile, which, with the numbers of small market-places, villages, and farms that were in Attica, is not to be wondered at.

The servants at Athens were of two sorts; the first were those who, through poverty, were forced to serve for wages, being otherwise free-born citizens, but not possessing any suffrage in public affairs on account of their indigence; it being forbidden, at some times, that persons not having such

* Thucyd. VII. 27.

† Boeckh, Public Economy of Athens, Vol. I. p. 53.

an estate as was mentioned in the law should have the privilege of giving their voices. These were properly called θῆτες and πελάται, and were the most genteel sort of servants, being only in that condition during their own pleasure and necessities, and having power either to change their masters, or, if they became able to subsist by themselves, wholly to release themselves from servitude. The other kind of servants were properly *slaves* wholly in the power of their masters, who had as good a *legal* title to them as to their lands or beasts of burden. What greatly enhanced the misery of their condition was, that they had little hope of recovering their freedom themselves, or of procuring it for their posterity. All the inheritance they could leave their children, (for their masters encouraged them to marry,) was the possession of their parents' miseries, and a condition but a little superior to that of beasts.

The following were the methods in which they were reduced to this deplorable bondage. First, some were poor, and being unable to subsist of themselves, and perhaps deeply in debt, were forced to part with their freedom, and yield themselves slaves to such as were able to maintain them. Secondly, vast numbers were reduced to slavery by the chance of war, by which the vanquished were placed wholly at the disposal of the conquerors. Thirdly, by the perfidiousness of those who traded in slaves, who often stole persons of ingenuous birth and education and sold them. Plato and Diogenes were sold as slaves. Aristophanes informs us that the Thessalians were notorious for this species of villany: —

> "Whence will you get slaves? I'll buy them with money.
> But where? for all the merchants leave off sale,
> Being sufficiently enriched? Driven by hope of more gain,
> The slave-dealer will come here from Thessaly."*

* Aristoph. Plut. Act II. Scene 5.

Fourthly, slaves were sold by the public authority. The father of Bion, the philosopher, was sold, together with his whole family, for an offence against the laws of the custom-house, though this did not take place at Athens.

At Athens, when a slave was first brought home, there was an entertainment provided to welcome him to his new service, and certain sweetmeats were poured upon his head. This ceremony was not practised elsewhere, though in all countries slaves were bought and sold like other commodities. The Thracians are particularly remarkable for purchasing them with salt.* The Chians, whose slaves, according to Thucydides, were very numerous and were treated with severity, insomuch that on one occasion they revolted in great numbers to the Athenians,† are reported to have been the first who gave money for slaves. Previously, they had been exchanged for other commodities, which was the ancient way of trading, before the invention of money. Homer's heroes are often said to have exchanged their captives for provisions. ‡

The following were some of the legal enactments respecting slavery, which were in force at various times at Athens. Persons of the meanest sort shall be capable of no magistracy. Let no person, who is a slave by birth, be made free of the city. They only shall be reckoned citizens, both whose parents are so. He shall be looked on as illegitimate, whose mother is not free. No illegitimate persons shall be obliged to keep their parents. No slave shall presume to anoint, or perform exercises in the palæstra. No slave, or woman other than free-born, shall study or practise physic.

* Therefore they were called *πρὸς ἁλὸς ἠγοράσμενα*.

† Thucyd. Hist. VIII. 48.

‡ See the end of the seventh book of the Iliad.

No slave shall caress a free-born youth; he who does so shall receive publicly fifty stripes. He that beats another man's servant may have an action of battery brought against him. No one may sell a captive for a slave, without the consent of his former master. If any captive has been sold, he shall be rescued; and let his rescuer put in sureties for his appearance before the polemarch. If the freedom of any slave has been unjustly arrested by another, the arrester shall be liable to pay half the price of the slave. Any slave, unable to drudge under the imperiousness of his master, may compel him to let him quit his service for one more mild and gentle. Slaves may buy themselves out of bondage. No slaves are to have their liberty given them in the theatre; the crier that proclaims it shall be *infamous*. All emancipated slaves shall pay certain services and due homage to the masters who gave them liberty, choosing them only for their patrons; and they shall not be wanting in the performance of those duties to which they are under obligation by law. Patrons are permitted to bring an action of ἀποστάσιον against such freed slaves as are remiss in the forementioned duties, and reduce them to their pristine state of bondage, if the charge be proved against them; but if the accusation be groundless, they shall completely enjoy their freedom. Any who have a mind, whether citizens or strangers, may appear as evidence in the abovementioned cause. He that redeems a prisoner of war may claim him as his own, unless the prisoner himself be able to pay his own ransom. Maintenance is by no means to be given to a slave careless in his duty.*

The Greeks were very industrious to prevent and sup-

* See the first volume of Potter's Greek Antiquities, pp. 144 – 182, *passim*. London ed. 1795.

press all such inclinations in slaves as would lead them to desire liberty. In general, they kept them at a great distance, by no means condescending to converse familiarly with them; instilling into them a mean opinion of themselves; debasing their natures, and extinguishing in them, as far as possible, all feelings of generosity and manliness, by an illiberal education, and accustoming them to blows and stripes, which they thought were very disagreeable to high-born souls. The following facts will show the general influence of slavery, according to the common practice of the greater part of the cities and tribes of Greece. It was accounted insufferable for slaves to imitate the conduct of a freeman, or offer to be like him, in their dress, or in any part of their behavior. In those cities where the free inhabitants permitted their hair to grow long, it was an unpardonable offence for a servant to have long hair.* They had a peculiar form after which they cut their hair,† which they laid aside if they ever recovered their liberty. And because slaves were generally rude and ignorant, the expression, "You have slavish hair in your soul," was generally applied to any dull, stupid fellow. A freeman's coat had two sleeves; that of a slave but one. The slaves covered their heads with bonnets;‡ an outer garment which they wore reached to the knees,§ and had at the bottom a strip of sheep-skin. They were subjected to degrading railleries from the stage.‖ Terence, the scene of whose Phormio was laid in Athens, affirms that the slaves

* Ἐπείτα δῆτα δούλος ὢν κομῆν ἔχεις. Aristoph. Avibus, 912.

† Θρὶξ ἀνδραποδώδης.

‡ Aristoph. Vesp. 443.

§ Κατωνάκας φοροῦντας. Aristoph. Lysis. 1153.

‖ Aristoph. Acharn. 507. Also Thucyd. Lib. I.

were neither permitted to plead for themselves, nor to be witnesses in any cause.* Yet it was customary to extort confession from them by torture; but, because this was often so violent as to occasion the death of the slave, or to disable him from being serviceable to his master, any person, who demanded a slave for this purpose, was obliged to give his master a sufficient security to answer the loss of his slave. The various modes of torturing slaves are mentioned by Aristophanes,† and other writers. The common way of correcting them for any offence was to scourge them with whips, sometimes made of hog's bristles. A villain, who had been guilty of any crime which deserved punishment, was said *μαστιγιᾶν*, to stand in need of, and as it were to itch for, the scourge. Sometimes, to prevent their shrinking, or running away, they were tied fast to a pillar. Those convicted of any notorious offence were condemned to grind at the mill, a labor very fatiguing in those days, when it was the custom to beat the grain into meal; our mills being the invention of later ages. When people wished to express the difficulty of any labor, it was usual to compare it to grinding in a mill.‡ They were also beaten with rods and scourges, sometimes, if their offence was very great, to death. The mills were in general called *μύλωνες*, which word Julius Pollux says was unlucky, because of the cru-

---

* "Servum hominem causam orare leges non sinunt;
Neque testimoni dictio est." — *Terence, Phorm.* Act I. Scene 4.

† "*ἐν κλίμακι*
Δήσας, κρεμάσας, ὑστριγίδι μαστιγῶν, δέρων,
Στεβλῶν, ἐπίτε τὰς ῥίνας ὄξος ἐγχέων,
Πλίνδους ἐπιτιθείς." — *Ran.* Act II. Scene 6.

‡ "Tibi mecum erit, Crasse, in eodem pistrino vivendum." — *Cicero de Orat.*

elty inflicted upon the slaves in mills. It was usual there to examine upon the rack. It was likewise customary to stigmatize slaves, which was usually done in the forehead, as being most visible. Sometimes other parts were thus used, it being not uncommon to punish the member which had offended. Thus the tongue of a tattler was cut out. The usual way of stigmatizing was, by burning the part with a red-hot iron marked with certain letters, till a fair impression was made, and then pouring ink into the furrows, that the inscription might be more conspicuous. Persons thus used were called *στιγματίαι*. Pliny calls them *inscripti*; Plautus, *literati*. This punishment was seldom or never inflicted upon any but slaves; and with them it was so frequent, that the Samians, when they gave a great number of slaves their liberty, and admitted them to offices in the State, were branded with the infamous name of *literati*. Among some nations, as the Thracians, Scythians, and Britons, the stigma was accounted a mark of honor. The slaves were branded with stigmata not only as a punishment for their offences, but to distinguish them in case they should run away. Soldiers were branded in the hand, but slaves on the forehead. In the same manner it was customary to stigmatize the votaries of some of the gods.*

Sometimes in war the slaves deserted to the enemy, which, excepting theft, a crime almost peculiar to them, was the most common offence they committed, being in many places the only way which they had to deliver themselves; but if they were taken, they were bound fast to a wheel, and unmercifully beaten with whips. The same

* See Galatians vi. 17, *τὰ στίγματα τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ σώματί μου βαστάζω*, i. e. the scars of wounds which show that I belong to the Lord Jesus. See also Rev. xiv. 9. 2 Cor. xi. 23, 25.

punishment was inflicted on them for theft.* They were occasionally racked on the wheel, a cruelty never practised upon a free-born person, to extort a confession from them, when they were suspected to have been accessory to any villanous design. Τύμπανα or τύπανα were cudgels or sticks of wood, with which criminals, particularly slaves, were beaten to death. The culprit was suspended to a stake, and beaten till he died.

The Greeks thought it lessened the dignity of free-born citizens to call slaves by any name that was in use among them. If any man presumed to give his slave the name of an honorable person, it was thought to be an intolerable offence. The Roman Emperor Domitian is said to have punished Metius Pomposianus, for calling his slaves by the illustrious names of Hannibal and Mago. The Athenians enacted a law, that no man should presume to call any of his servants by the names of Harmodius and Aristogeiton, renowned defenders of liberty, who opposed the misrule of the two sons of Pisistratus. The Athenians were also forbidden to derive the names of their slaves from any of the solemn games. For the most part, according to Strabo, they were called after the names of their native countries, as Ανδός or Σύρος, if they were born in Lydia or Syria ; or by the names which are most used in those nations, as Manes or Midas in Phrygia ; Tibias in Paphlagonia. The most common names in Athens were Geta and Davus, being taken from the Getes and Daci. They seldom consisted of above two syllables, and therefore Demosthenes, having objected to Æschines that his father was a slave,

* "Non furtum feci, nec fugi, si mihi dicat
Servus, habes pretium, loris non ureris, aio."
Hor. Epist. I.

tells him further, as a proof of what he affirms, that he had falsified his name, calling it Atrometus, when in fact it was Tromes. The reason seems to have been the same as in the case of dogs; a short name being more easy of pronunciation. It was common for slaves who had recovered their freedom, to change their names for those of more syllables. Above all things, especial care was taken that slaves should not wear arms, which, since their number was in general altogether greater than that of the citizens, might have been dangerous to the public. On this account it was not usual for them to serve in wars.* Yet in case of extreme danger it was allowed, and sometimes when there was no such emergency. For the maintenance of security and order at Athens there was a city guard, composed of public slaves.† These persons, though of low rank, enjoyed a certain consideration, as the state employed them in the capacity of constables. These public slaves were also appointed for the trade-police; and subordinate places, such as those of heralds and checking clerks, together with other offices in the assemblies and courts of justice, were filled by persons of the same description. The public slaves composed the body-guard of the Athenians. They are generally called bowmen, or, from the native country of the majority, Scythians, or Speusinians. They lived under tents in the market-place, and afterwards on the Areopagus. Among their number were many Thracians and

* "Vix unus Helenor,
Et Lycus elapsi, quorum primævus Helenor;
Mæonio regi quem serva Licymnia furtim
Sustulerat, *vetitisque* ad Trojam miserat armis."
Virg. Æn. IX. 545.

† δημόσιοι.

other barbarians. Their officers had the name of toxarchs. In the first instance, 300 were purchased soon after the battle of Salamis. The number soon rose to 1,000 or 1,200. These troops might, if necessary, be used in the field. As they were able-bodied men, they probably cost three or four minas apiece, and, to keep the number good, thirty or forty must have been purchased yearly, costing in all from one to two talents. Their pay was perhaps three oboli a day.*

A large number of the rowers on board the fleets were slaves. This will not be considered strange, if it be borne in mind that the Spartans brought their Helots with them into the field; that the Thessalian mounted Penestæ were bondmen; that a considerable number of slaves were always employed in war as attendants on the army, who were sometimes even manumitted; that slaves were said to have fought as early as at the battle of Marathon, and afterwards at Chæronea, when the Athenians granted them their liberty. It is remarked as an unusual circumstance, that the seamen of the Paralos were all freemen.† At the successful sea-fight of Arginusæ, there were many slaves in the Athenian fleet;‡ and it equally redounds to the honor of both parties, on the one hand, that victory was chiefly owing to the slaves, and, on the other, that the Athenians immediately emancipated them, and made them Platæan citizens.§ A large number of slaves were considered, not as useful only, but as necessary, to a State which possessed a naval force. It was only on some pressing emergency that citizens were employed as rowers.

---

* An obolus was about 1⅓ cents of our money; a drachma, 8 cents; a mina, about $ 8; and a talent, about $ 480.

† Thucyd. VIII. 73.

‡ Xenophon, Hell. 1. 6. 17.

§ Aristoph. Ran. 706.

In mining, as in every thing where labor was necessary, the actual work was performed by slaves. It does not appear that in Greece free citizens ever labored in the mines or founderies under the compulsion of tyrants. The Romans condemned the offenders who had been enslaved by public ordinance, to work in the mines, in the same manner that criminals of this description are now sent by the Emperor of Russia to the mines of Siberia. This method of punishment cannot, however, have existed at Athens, as the community did not carry on any mining at the public expense; nor did it let mines for a term of years together with the laborers, which was only done by private individuals. The master, however, could probably punish his slaves, by forcing them to labor in the mines as well as in the mills; and, in general, none but inferior slaves were employed in them, such as barbarians and criminals. Their condition was not, indeed, so miserable as that of the slaves in the Egyptian mines, where the condemned laborers worked without intermission until they were so exhausted as to fall senseless; but notwithstanding that in Attica the spirit of freedom had a mild and benevolent influence even on the treatment of slaves, yet myriads of slaves are said to have languished in chains in the unwholesome atmosphere of the mines.* As was the case in Italy and Sicily, and as it has frequently been in modern times, the insurrection of these hordes of slaves was in Greece neither unfrequent, nor unaccompanied with danger. In a fragment of Posidonius, the continuer of the history of Polybius, it is related that the mine-slaves in Attica murdered their guards, took forcible possession of the fortifications of Sunium, and from this point ravaged the country for a considerable time; an oc-

* Athen. VII. Plutarch comp. Nicias and Crassus init.

currence which probably belongs to the end of the 91st Olympiad, about which time, during the war of Decelea, more than 20,000 slaves, of whom the greater proportion were manual laborers, escaped from the Athenians.* Of the slaves who worked in the mines, some belonged to the lessees, and for some a rent was paid to the proprietor, the maintenance being provided by the person who hired them. The price of slaves varied, according to their bodily and mental qualities, from half a mina to five and ten minas. A common mining slave, however, did not cost at Athens more than from three to six minas, and, in the age of Demosthenes, not more than from 125 to 150 drachmas.

When Nicias, the son of Niceratus, gave a talent for an overseer of his mines, we are to understand a person in whom he might repose entire confidence. For the most part, compulsion was the only incentive to labor, and little favor was ever shown to the slaves. By the hiring of slaves, the profit was distributed into various channels, and by this means persons who would have otherwise been unable to advance capital for so expensive an undertaking, were enabled to engage in the business.†

Slaves were generally treated at Athens with more humanity than in any other place. Under grievous oppression, they were allowed to flee to the temple of Theseus, whence to force them was an act of sacrilege. Those who had been barbarously treated by their masters, were allowed the privilege of commencing a suit at law against them. If it appeared that the complaint was reasonable, the master was obliged to sell his slave. Also, if any other citizen did them

* Thucyd. VII. 27.

† See the Dissertation of Boeckh on the silver mines of Laurion in Attica, originally inserted in the Berlin Transactions.

an injury, they were allowed to vindicate themselves by a course of law. It appears also, from the comedies of Plautus, Terence, and Aristophanes, that they enjoyed great freedom of discourse, and had many pleasures which were denied them elsewhere. Demosthenes informs us, that the condition of a slave in Athens was preferable to that of a free citizen in some other cities; which remark, allowing for the antithesis of the orator, must have contained some truth. They were sometimes permitted to acquire estates for themselves, and to take shares in the mines on their own account. If they could procure enough to pay for their liberty, no one had any power to hinder them. Sometimes their masters dismissed them, if faithful, of their own accord. On the performance of any remarkable service for the public, the State generally took care to reward them with liberty. Yet they were not advanced to the rank of citizens without great difficulty and opposition. Slaves, as long as they were under the government of a master, were called οἰκέται, but, after their freedom was granted them, they were named δοῦλοι, not being, like the former, a part of their master's estate, but only required to render some small services, such as were required of the μέτοικοι, to whom in some respects they were inferior.*

Before closing this subject, it will be interesting to inquire respecting the sentiments of some of the philosophers and authors of Greece, on the right and expediency of the institution of slavery. Alcidamas, the scholar of Gorgias of Leontium, has this remark: "All come free from the hands of God; nature has made no man a slave." † Phile-

* Potter's Antiquities, Vol. I. p. 68.

† Scholiast on Aristotle's Rhetoric, Gillies's Greece, Vol. II. p. 337.

mon says, "Though he is a slave, yet he has the same nature with ourselves. No one was ever born a slave, though his body by misfortune may be brought into subjection."* Menander remarks that slaves ought not to be treated unjustly.† Aristotle, in his Politics, has taken up the subject with his usual scientific nicety. "By some writers," says Aristotle, "that part of economy, employed in the management of slaves, has been dignified with the name of science; by others, slavery is considered as an institution altogether unnatural, resulting from the cruel maxims of war. Liberty, they assert, is the great law of nature, which acknowledges not any difference between the slave and the master; slavery is therefore unjust, being founded on violence. But property at large is merely an accumulation of instruments, to be moved and employed for the comfortable subsistence of a family; and even a slave is in this view a movable instrument, endowed with life, which, impelled by the will of another, communicates motion to other instruments less excellent than himself. Among the instruments subservient to the comfort of human life, there is this material distinction, that the work performed by one class consists in production, and the work performed by another is totally consumed in use. A domestic slave is relative to use; his labor is totally consumed in promoting the ease of his master. He is merely the possession and property, or, as it were, the separable part of that master; and every part, whether separable or inseparable, is to be employed, not according to its own caprice or humor, but in subserviency to the general good, and suitably to reason. It is to be regarded simply in relation to that whole or system to which it appertains. A slave is

* Fragments of Menander and Philemon, p. 226. † Ibid. 40.

simply the property of his master; but the master stands in many other relations besides that of proprietor to his slaves. Such is the nature of servitude. We proceed to examine whether the institution be wise and just.

"To determine this question, it will be sufficient to contemplate the ordinary course of nature, and to deduce from our observations clear inferences of reason. Government and subjection, then, are things useful and necessary; they prevail everywhere, in animated, as well as in brute matter. From their first origin, some natures are formed to command, and others to obey; the kinds of government and subjection varying with the differences of their objects, but all equally useful for their respective ends; and those kinds the most excellent, from which the most excellent consequences ensue. In compositions endowed with life, it is the province of mind to command, and of matter to obey. Man consists of soul and body, and, in all men rightly constituted, the soul commands the body; though some men are so grossly depraved, that in them the body seems to command the soul. But here the order of nature is perverted.* Those men, therefore, whose powers are chiefly confined to the body, and whose principal excellence consists in affording bodily service; those, I say, are naturally slaves, because it is their interest to be so. They can obey reason, though they are unable to exercise it; and though different from tame animals, who are disciplined by means merely of their sensations and appetites, they perform nearly the same tasks, and become the property of other men because their own safety requires it.†

* In this passage, Aristotle's better reason seems to go beyond his theory, and the prejudices of the age in which he lived.

† But who or what shall determine the degree of servility which

"In conformity with these observations, nature, we see, has variously moulded the human frame. Some men are strongly built and firmly compacted; others erect and graceful, unfit for toil and drudgery, but capable of sustaining honorably the offices of war and peace. This, however, holds not universally; for a servile mind is often lodged in a graceful person; and we have often found bodies formed for servitude, animated by the souls of freemen. Yet the distinction itself is not frivolous; for were part of the human race to be arrayed in that splendor of beauty which beams from the statues of the gods, universal consent would acknowledge the rest of mankind naturally formed to be their slaves. The difference of minds, though less obvious, is far more characteristic and important; whence we may conclude that slavery is founded both on utility and justice.

"This decision, however, has been arraigned with considerable plausibility; for slavery may be taken in two senses, in one of which he is a slave who submits to the laws of war, commanding the vanquished to become the property of the victors. This is acknowledged to be law;

---

shall reduce one to the condition of slavery? Who has the power or intelligence to go round with his inkhorn, and brand the subject of freedom and slavery respectively? By the adoption of the rule proposed, many of us would be called to grind in the mill. The 20,000 free Athenians might have been sadly diminished. Plato, Aristotle, Socrates, and a few of similar stamp, might have escaped. Besides, actual slavery never made such a separation as Aristotle indicates. The fact is wholly the reverse. There were noble men in great numbers, who were toiling on the farms of Laconia, chained to the oars of the fleets, or delving into the mines of Laurion. It was Æsop, Alcman, Epictetus, Terence, who were slaves, while many a brainless free demagogue was haranguing in the forum, or squandering the hard-earned produce of the poor slave in the house of some fair Milesian.

but the law itself is accused of iniquity. On this subject, wise men hold different opinions. Some consider superiority as the proof of virtue; while others deny the force of this argument, maintaining that nothing can be truly just, which is inconsistent with humanity. Unjust wars are often successful, by which persons of illustrious merit are reduced to slavery. To avoid this conclusion, the other party propose to limit this law to the case of barbarians vanquished by Greeks; for the nobility of barbarians is confined to their respective countries, but the nobility of Greece is as extensive as the world. But in so doing, they abandon their own principle, and acknowledge the principles which we have established, that slavery adheres to the character itself, and is independent of accident. There are thus two kinds of slavery, the one founded on nature, the other established by law, or rather produced by violence. The first kind can take place only when the master is as fit to command as the slave to obey.* It is then profitable both to the slave and master; whose interests, rightly understood, become as inseparable as the interests of soul and body."

It will thus be seen, that the peculiarity of the relation between master and slave results, according to Aristotle, on the superiority of character in one man over another. The sole condition seems to be, that one man knows how to command, and another knows how to obey. The author shows the mildness of his nature, in his advice to masters to secure the fidelity of slaves by the pledges of wives and children, and to indulge them with the enjoyment of festivals and

* This kind of slavery would be extremely rare. It has always been found unsafe to trust men with such power as a master exercises over a slave. It almost inevitably exerts a bad effect on the master. Besides, who is to determine what men are fit to command?

diversions, of which their condition stands more in need than that of freemen. In the treatment of slaves and peasants, he considers it to be exceedingly difficult to hit the middle point between the extremes of indulgence and harshness; that indulgence which is productive of insolence, and that harshness that will be repaid with hatred.

Xenophon, following the example of his master, Socrates, raises no objection against the institution of slavery. Plato, in his Republic, only desires that no Greeks may be reduced to slavery. In the sixth book of his treatise De Legibus, he adverts to the question of the expediency of slavery. He says that many slaves have been found superior, in their kindness towards masters, to the brothers and sons of the family, practising all fidelity both in respect to persons and property. On the other hand, he says, that there seems to be nothing in the soul of a slave, which can be a foundation for trustworthiness; verifying the assertion of Homer, that in the day when Jupiter makes slaves of men, he deprives them of half their reason. Alluding to the instances of the Messenians and some of the Italian cities, he remarks that the slaves have caused all manner of disturbances, so that an observer considering such facts would be disposed to denounce the whole system as inexpedient and worthless. He agrees with Aristotle, that it is of the first importance, though very difficult, to preserve, in the treatment of slaves, the due medium between severity on the one hand, and indulgence on the other.

How a thinking and philosophic mind could have failed to see the utter incongruity between the boasted freedom of the Greek republics and the iron slavery which they tolerated, seems to us an exceedingly difficult problem. At the time when Demosthenes was uttering his words of fire

to the few thousands of free Athenians, stimulating them to rise up against the aggressions of the Northern tyrant, as he called Philip, there were 400,000 human beings, whose life and liberty were at the mercy of a most despotic democracy. We shall, however, cease to wonder, when we reflect on the inconsistencies of human nature. In all ages of the world, the men who have been most jealous of liberty in their own persons, have been most willing to take it from others. The boon is too sweet to be distributed. The highest zest is given to the enjoyment by contrast. The liberty coveted is that resulting from instant obedience to every species of authority ; in other words, it is the liberty of despotism. If an ancient traveller had wished to see the greatest amount of solid happiness, enjoyed by *all* ranks, he must have left republican Sparta and Athens, and visited the *monarchy* of Macedon. We ought, however, to consider that the civil polity of Greece was in general so arranged as, perhaps, to render slavery indispensable. The institutions of Minos, Lycurgus, and Solon, derived, doubtless, in a great measure from Egypt or from some other Oriental source, were in many respects fundamentally wrong. They made agriculture, manufactures, mercantile pursuits, and all the useful arts, unpopular. The free citizens were intended either for soldiers or politicians ; the latter oftentimes furnishing employment for the former. Sparta, as has been remarked, was saved by war and ruined by peace. The theory of Lycurgus, in more than one respect, was at war with the human race. He instilled a stoical fortitude into the bosoms of the Spartans, which found no opportunity for exercise, except in enduring the chances of war, or witnessing the anguish of the Helots.

In the numerous wars which desolated, and, finally, in

conjunction with other causes, ruined the Grecian States, there was one signal alleviation. In the twenty-seven years of the Peloponnesian war, along with the various miseries which it occasioned, it brought very important benefits to the slaves. When all the neighboring republics were friendly, the slave looked around in vain for refuge from the cruelty of an inhuman master; but if they were hostile, it behooved equally the wealthy despot of many slaves, and the poor tyrant of one, to beware how he set the wretch upon comparing the risk of desertion with the hope of a better service. Even at Athens, where, in general, slaves were better treated than elsewhere, war produced regulations to soften their condition. In the comedy of Aristophanes called the Clouds (v. 7), we find an old country gentleman of Attica ludicrously execrating the war, because he was no longer allowed to beat his slaves.

The Grecian States suffered one of the most common and pernicious evils of slavery, the absence of an enlightened and virtuous middle class, — that part in society, which constitutes its true glory and defence. In Athens, this class of men could not be intrusted with any public office, give their votes in the assemblies, or have any share in the government. They were obliged patiently to submit to all the laws enacted by the citizens. Aristophanes compares them to chaff, as being an unprofitable and useless part of the commonwealth. The women were obliged to carry vessels of water, and also umbrellas to defend the free women from the weather. The men were taxed twelve drachmas annually, and the women six. Upon non-payment of this tax, they were liable to be sold into slavery. Diogenes Laertius was actually sold, because he had not wherewithal to pay this tribute. This was a natural effect of the institution of

slavery. Almost every species of manual labor was considered degrading, because performed by slaves. Emigrants, foreigners, and all those who were not citizens, were in general compelled to resort to personal labor in order to obtain a subsistence. Consequently, in the view of public opinion, they were fit subjects for oppression and insult. They stood between the slaves and freemen, and felt little sympathy for either, and in case of an insurrection took part with the stronger. It was a grand defect in the Grecian forms of government, that they did not adequately provide for all the classes in the community. A large part of the population was cut off from all sympathy with the country. Where slaves abound, rich men can dispense with the labor of the poor, while the poor profit in no way from the prosperity of the rich. The consequences of this state of things form one of the most prominent features of Grecian history.

Greece was at length absorbed in the Roman Empire. Subsequently, the Roman slave-trade, in that part of the world, seems to have been mainly carried on at Delos. That island rose into importance, as a commercial place, after the fall of Corinth, and grew an *entrepôt* for trade of every sort, between the East and West, but principally for that in slaves. It was resorted to by the Romans more than by any other people, and the slave-trade which they encouraged was so brisk, that the port became proverbial for such traffic, and was capable, says Strabo, of importing and reëxporting 10,000 slaves in a single day. The Cilician pirates made Delos the great staple for the sale of their captives, which was a very gainful part of their occupation. Delos ceased to be the great mart, after the Mithridatic war; and it seems probable, that, afterwards, the slave-trade was

transferred to the various ports nearest those countries whence the slaves came; and therefore, perhaps, to the cities upon the Euxine, to which the Romans might not have made direct voyages at an earlier time. Corinth was long the chief slave-mart of Greece, and, from its situation, was likely to have much communication with the ports on the eastern side of Italy; but we meet with no authority for believing, that the Romans resorted much thither for slaves, or other commodities, before their conquest of Greece.

In the epistles of Paul to the Grecian churches, there are a few allusions to slavery. Many of the poor *chœnix-measurers* of Corinth, weary and heavy laden, doubtless welcomed with great eagerness the doctrines of the Gospel. Though among the foolish and weak and despised things of that luxurious metropolis, yet God chose them to be the freemen of the heavenly city. The instructions which Paul gave to them were of this tenor: "Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called. Art thou called being a servant (δοῦλος)? care not for it; but if thou mayest be made free, use it rather. For he that is called in the Lord, being a servant, is the Lord's freeman; likewise also he that is called, being free, is Christ's servant. Ye are bought with a price; be not ye the servants of men. Brethren, let every man, wherein he is called, therein abide with God." * The exhortation, which Paul gives to the Thessalonians respecting manual labor, shows what class of the community he was addressing.† The same Apostle directs Titus, who had been left in Crete, where peasants and slaves, bearing the name of Periæci, Clarotæ, and Mnoitæ, had existed from the earliest times, to "exhort servants to be obe-

* 1 Cor. vii. 20–24. † 1 Thess. iv. 11; 2 Thess. iii. 10–12.

dient unto their own masters, and to please them well in all things; not answering again, but showing all good fidelity; that they may adorn the doctrine of God their Saviour in all things." * The Apostle here adverts to those vices, to which slaves in all ages have been peculiarly addicted, — pilfering and petulance. The maid at Philippi, who had the spirit of divination, or of a soothsaying demon, and who was very profitable to her masters, was doubtless a slave.†

There does not seem to have been any material difference, on the whole, between the treatment experienced by the slaves under the Grecian and the Roman governments. The Helots might have enjoyed some advantages from the fact that they were the property of the State, and lived away from the immediate control of masters, in a condition somewhat similar to that of the serfs of modern Russia; yet they were liable to the horrible *cryptia*. Previously to the reign of Antoninus Pius, the slave at Rome was much less protected by law and public feeling than the slave at Athens. At Sparta, slaves seem to have had hardly any hope of ever being admitted amongst freemen. At Athens, emancipation was frequent; but the privileges of citizens rarely followed, even to a limited extent, and were conferred by public authority only. At Rome, the lowest slave could always look forward to manumission, and to obtaining the rank of a citizen, through the sole will of his master. Still, the Romans, like the Greeks, never came so far from the original view, of slaves being the absolute property of their owner, as to consider the master's rights limited to the unpaid services of the slave, and his powers restricted to those of a domestic magistrate, for correction of slight

* Titus ii. 9, 10; also Aristotle's Politics, Book II. † Acts xvi. 16.

misconduct, and for enforcement of obedience and exertion. *

The effect of Christianity, in meliorating the usage of slaves, though not sudden, was important. The various Christian Emperors issued decrees, abridging the power of masters, and raising slaves above the level of insentient creatures. The Church openly condemned the barbarous treatment of slaves. Clemens Alexandrinus, in the close of the second century, forbade the bishop to accept the oblations of cruel and sanguinary masters. At last Justinian did most to encourage improvement in the condition of bondmen, and to promote the ultimate extinction of slavery.†

---

* See William Blair's Inquiry into the State of Slavery among the Romans, London, 1833. Also Dunlop's History of Roman Literature.

† Gibbon's Hist. Decline and Fall, Chap. XLIV.

ROMAN SLAVERY IN THE EARLY CENTURIES OF THE CHRISTIAN ERA.*

VARIOUS definitions are given by the Roman and other writers of the word *servus*. Scaliger derives it from *servando*, because the slave preserves or guards the property of his master. Slaves are denominated *servi*, says the Code of Justinian, from the verb *servare*, to preserve; for it is the practice of our generals to sell their captives; being accustomed to preserve and not to destroy them. Slaves are also called *Mancipia*, *a manu capere*, in that they are taken by the hand of the enemy. Just. Lib. I. Tit. 3. The origin of the word *servus*, says Augustine, De Civit. Lib. XIX. Cap. 15, is understood to be derived from the fact, that prisoners, who by the laws of war might have been put to death, were preserved by the victors, and made slaves. "Servus est nomen," says Seneca, "ex injuria natum." † *Servi*, *servitia*, and *mancipia* are frequently used as convertible terms. The term for a slave born and bred in the family was *verna*.

* This Essay was published in the Biblical Repository for October, 1835, and was subsequently republished in Great Britain.

† Aristotle's definition of a slave was applicable to Italy, Polit. I. 6: κτῆμα καὶ ὄργανον τοῦ δεσπότου ἔμψυχον.

In respect to the comparative number of the slaves and the free citizens of Rome, we have not sufficient data on which to found a correct judgment. We may agree with Niebuhr in doubting the accuracy of the older *censuses*, which were taken at Rome. The Romans, in the early periods of their history, rarely or never acted as menial servants in the city. Niebuhr thinks that mechanical occupations were not lawful for plebeians. Yet in the country they willingly performed agricultural labor. Lipsius admits the probability of there being as many slaves as freemen, or rather more, within Rome in its most populous times. After the influx of wealth, which followed the foreign conquests, the number of slaves must have been greatly enlarged. Polybius, Hist. ch. II., estimates the forces which the Romans and their allies could bring into the field, between the first and second Punic wars, at 770,000 men. This enumeration, however, implying a total free class of 3,080,000, and an equal amount of slave population, is much larger than seems consistent with the state of Italy at that time. The number of citizens returned to Augustus at the 72d lustrum, A. U. C. 745, as appears from the monument of Ancyra, was 4,163,000. At the 73d lustrum, the number was over 4,000,000. In the 74th lustrum, in the reign of Claudius, A. D. 48, the citizens amounted to 6,944,000, of whom, probably, but a small proportion consisted of persons out of Italy. If we allow two slaves to each Roman, an average below that of some Grecian cities, we should not in that case take into the account those slaves who were the property of the various orders of freemen, or those who belonged to other slaves. Rich citizens were very extensive owners of slaves, kept both for luxury and profit, as domestics or artisans in town, and as laborers on

the vast estates in the provinces.* Some rich individuals are said to have possessed 10,000, and even 20,000, of their fellow-creatures. Seneca says, De Tran. Animi. ch. VIII., that Demetrius, the freedman of Pompey, was richer than his master. "Numerus illi quotidie servorum, velut imperatori exercitus, referebatur." The slaves of Crassus formed a large part of his fortune. His architects and masons alone exceeded 500. Scaurus possessed above 4,000 domestic, and as many rural slaves. In the reign of Augustus, a freedman, who had sustained great losses during the civil wars, left 4,116 slaves, besides other property. On one occasion, the family of Pedanius Secundus, prefect of Rome under Nero, was found to consist of 400 slaves: Tac. Ann. XIV. 43, "Quem numerus servorum tuebitur, cum .... quadringenti," etc. When the wife of Apuleius gave up the lesser part of her estate to her son, 400 slaves formed one of the items surrendered. Slaves always composed a great part of the movable property of individuals, and formed a chief article of ladies' dowries. A law passed by Augustus against the excessive manumission of slaves by testament, forbidding any one to bequeathe liberty to more than one fifth of all his slaves, contains the following words: "Plures autem quam centum ex majori numero servorum manumitti non licet." † We may hence infer that 500 was not an extraordinary number of slaves to be held by one owner. It was fashionable to go abroad attended by a large number of slaves. Horace, Sat. Lib. I. iii. 11, says, "Habebat sæpe ducentos, sæpe decem servos." Augustus prohibited exiles

* Pignorius has enumerated 48 classes of *rustic slaves*, 40 of *rustic* or *urban*, 60 of *urban*, 66 of *personal attendants*, 15 of *upper servants*, 13 of *nursery slaves*, 130 of *slaves of luxury*, and 5 of *military slaves*, in all *three hundred and twenty-five classes*.

† Hugo, Jus Civile Antejustinianeum, Vol. I. p. 157.

from carrying with them more than 20 slaves.* Besides the domestic and agricultural slaves, were the gladiators, who were chiefly slaves, and who were extremely numerous at different periods. We may have some idea of the frequency and ferociousness with which these were exhibited, from a restriction imposed by Augustus, who forbade magistrates to give shows of gladiators above twice in one year, or of more than 60 pairs at one time. Julius Cæsar exhibited at once 320 pairs. Trajan exhibited them for 123 days, in the course of which 10,000 gladiators fought. The State and corporate bodies possessed very many slaves. For example, 600 were employed in guarding against fires in Rome.† Chrysostom says, that under Theodosius the Great, and Arcadius, some persons had 2,000 or 3,000 slaves. Sȳnesius complains, that every family of tolerable means kept Scythian slaves of luxury; and Ammianus Marcellinus informs us, that luxurious ladies and great men used to have 400 or 500 servile attendants. From the time of Augustus to Justinian, we may allow three slaves to one freeman; we shall thus have a free population in Italy of 6,944,000, and of slaves 20,832,000, — total 27,776,000. "After weighing every circumstance which could influence the balance," says Gibbon, "it seems probable, that there existed in the time of Claudius about twice as many provincials as there were citizens, of either sex, and of every age; and that the slaves were at least equal in number to the free inhabitants of the Roman world. The total amount of this imperfect calculation would rise to about 120,000,000 of persons." ‡

---

* See Plin. Nat. Hist. XXXIII. 47, 52; also XXXIV. 6, and XXXV. 58.

† "Publicos servos." Liv. IX. 29.

‡ The present population of Italy is between 16,000,000 and

The different methods in which men became slaves were by war, commerce, the operation of law in certain cases, and by their birth.

1. *Slaves acquired by war.* In general, prisoners of war were sold immediately, or as soon as possible, after their capture. If a subsequent treaty provided for their release, it would appear that a special law was passed, ordering the buyers of such slaves to give them up, on receiving from the treasury repayment of the original purchase money. Livy, XLII. 8, says in relation to the Ligurians, 10,000 of whom had surrendered themselves as prisoners, "At ille [consul] arma omnibus ademit, oppidum diruit, ipsos bonaque eorum vendidit." As the Senate were at the time deliberating about the treatment of them, " res visa atrox " ; and a decree was issued, annulling the previous sales, and compelling the respective purchasers to set the Ligurians free, but with restitution by the public of the prices which had been paid. Prisoners belonging to a revolted nation were, without exception in favor of voluntary surrender, sold into servitude ; and, sometimes, as a more severe punishment, or for greater precaution, it was stipulated at their sale, that they should be carried to distant places, and should not be manumitted within twenty or thirty years.* After the fall of the Samnites at Aquilonia, 2,033,000 pieces of brass were realized by the sale of prisoners, who amounted to about 36,000.† Lucretius brought from the Volscian war 1,250

17,000,000. See the Essay of Hume on the Populousness of Ancient Nations ; Gibbon, Hist. Dec. and Fall, Ch. II. ; Blair's Inquiry into the State of Roman Slavery, Ch. I.

* "Ne in vicina regione servirent, neve intra tricesimum annum liberarentur." — *Sueton. Octav.* XXI.

† "Id æs redactum ex captivis dicebatur." — *Livy,* X. 46.

captives; and, by the capture of one inconsiderable town, no less than 4,000 slaves were obtained. On the descent of the Romans upon Africa, in the first Punic war, 20,000 prisoners were taken. Gelon, prætor of Syracuse, having routed a Carthaginian army, took such a number of captives, that he gave 500 of them to each of the several citizens of Agrigentum. On the great victory of Marius and Catulus over the Cimbri, 60,000 were captured. When Pindenissus was taken by Cicero, the inhabitants were sold for more than £ 100,000. Augustus, having overcome the Salassi, sold as slaves 36,000, of whom 8,000 were capable of bearing arms. Cæsar, in his Gallic wars, according to the moderate estimate of Velleius Paterculus, took more than 400,000 prisoners. The rule, which forbade prisoners taken in civil wars to be dealt with as slaves, was sometimes disregarded. On the taking of Cremona by the forces of Vitellius, his general Antonius ordered that none of the captives should be detained; and the soldiers could find no purchasers for them.* A slave, carried off from the Roman territories by the enemy, fell again under his master's authority, if he came back or was retaken. Roman citizens, who had been made prisoners, recovered their former rank, with all the rights and privileges belonging to it, upon their escape or recapture from the enemy's hands.

2. *Slaves acquired by commerce.* The slave-trade in Africa is as old as history reaches back. Among the ruling nations of the North coast, — the Egyptians, Cyrenians, and Carthaginians, — slavery was not only established, but

* The language of Tacitus, Hist. Lib. III, is, "Irritamque prædam militibus effecerat consensus Italiæ, emptionem talium mancipiorum adspernantis. Occidi cœpere: quod ubi enotuit, a propinquis adfinibusque occulte redemptebantur."

they imported whole armies of slaves, partly for home use, and partly, at least among the Carthaginians, to be shipped for foreign markets. They were chiefly drawn from the interior, where kidnapping was just as much carried on then as it is now. Black male and female slaves were even an article of luxury, not only among the above-mentioned nations, but in Greece and Italy. The Troglodyte Ethiopians seem to have been a wild negro race, dwelling in caves in the neighboring mountains, who were kidnapped by the Garamantes to be sold for slaves.* The slave-trade in Africa was directed mainly to females, who, in the Balearian Islands, were sold for three times as much as the men.† For the building of public works at Rome, vast numbers of slaves were procured. The piers, porticos, aqueducts, and roads, whose magnificent ruins are now an object of admiration, were constructed by the sweat and blood of slaves. In raising such a structure as the mausoleum of Adrian, thousands of wretched men, torn from their own firesides, toiled unto death. The island of Delos became an extensive mart for slaves. In that opulent emporium 10,000 could be bought and sold in a single day. Predatory excursions were made into Cilicia, Pamphylia, and Syria, and great numbers were carried off to the market-places of Sidon, or Delos. For a long period, great numbers of slaves ("maxi-

* Heeren's Hist. Researches, Vol. I, Oxford edit., pp. 181, 223, 239. "Cum obsidibus Carthaginiensium, ut principum liberis, magna vis servorum erat. Augebant eorum numerum, ut ab recenti Africo bello, et ab ipsis Setinis captiva aliquot nationis ejus ex præda empta mancipia." — *Livy*, XXXII. 26.

† "Tibi pocula cursor
Gætulus dabit, aut nigri manus ossea Mauri,
Et cui per mediam nolis occurrere noctem,
Clivosæ veheris dum per monumenta Latina." — *Juv.* V. 51.

mus mancipiorum fuit proventus") were drawn from the interior of Asia Minor, particularly from Phrygia and Cappadocia. *Slave* and *Phrygian* became almost convertible terms. So great a multitude were carried into slavery, that but few towns were planted; the country was rather a pasturage for flocks. There were 6,000 slaves which belonged to the temple of a goddess in Cappadocia. Hence the words of Horace, "Mancipiis locuples, eget æris Cappadocum rex." * At an early period, the emporia for slaves, from the extensive Scythian regions, were Panticapæum, Dioscurias, and Phanagoria, all on the Euxine or Black Sea. Slaves appear to have reached the market of Rome, under the Cæsars, in separate bands, composed of natives of their several countries. The Getæ probably came from a country a little to the east of Pontus. The Davi were probably an Oriental race. Alexandria was a considerable place for the sale of slaves of a particular kind. Slaves possessing certain accomplishments were procured from Cadiz.† Corsica, Sardinia, and Britain, were the birthplace of slaves. The profits of dealers, who bought slaves that were captured in distant wars, were often enormous. In the camp of Lucullus, in Pontus, a man might be purchased for three shillings, while the lowest price for which the same slave could be had at Rome was, perhaps, nearly £ 15.‡ In most countries, it was common for parents to sell their children into slavery. In trafficking with comparatively barbarous nations, dealers procured slaves by barter, at a very cheap rate. Salt, for example, was anciently much

* See Heyne's Opuscula Academica, Vol. IV. p. 137. Göttingen, 1796.

† "Forsitan expectes, ut Gaditana canoro," etc. — *Juv. Sat.* XI. 162.

‡ Plutarch, Vit. Lucullus.

taken by the Thracians in exchange for human beings. Man-stealing was, at all times, a very prevalent crime among the ancients. Paul in denouncing man-stealers, 1 Tim. i. 10, as among the worst of sinners, impresses us with the belief, that the offence was very frequent. Even Romans were often carried off into illegal bondage, especially in troublous times, when individuals were permitted to keep private jails and workhouses, which served both for detention and concealment.* In calamitous times, the sale of children by their indigent parents was of frequent occurrence. Constantine allowed a new-born infant to be sold under the pressure of extreme want. This sale, in any need, was legalized by Theodosius the Great.

3. *Free-born Romans might be reduced to slavery by the operation of law.* Criminals doomed to certain ignominious punishments were, by effect of their sentence, deprived of citizenship, and sunk into a state of servitude. They were then termed *servi pœnæ*, and during the Commonwealth were the property of the public. A pardon or remission of the penalty left the convict still a slave, unless he was restored to his former rank by a special act of grace. But this condition of penal slavery was entirely abolished by Justinian. Of old, those that did not give in their names for enrolment in the militia, were beaten and sold into bondage beyond the Tiber. Those who did not make proper returns to the censor, were liable to be visited with the same punishment. An indigent thief was adjudged as a slave to the injured party. By the Claudian decree, reënacted under Vespasian, it was ordered that a free-born woman, having an intrigue with another person's slave, should herself be made

* "Repurgandorum tota Italia ergastulorum, quorum domini in invidiam venerant," etc. — *Suet. Vit. Tib.* VIII.

the slave of her paramour's master. Various other laws of this sort were passed under the Emperors. In early times, the exposure of children was common.* Both the Senecas relate that the custom of exposing feeble and deformed children was common.† Healthful infants were also sometimes left to perish. Not only prostitutes, but the wives of the most noble Romans, were frequently guilty of destroying their children before their birth. ‡ It came at length to be established as a rule, that those fathers or masters who exposed their own, or their slaves' offspring, should lose their respective rights, and that the children should become the slaves of any one who chose to take them up and support them. Justinian at last ordered that all exposed children should be free. Vagrant slaves, *mancipia vaga*, were dealt with as stray goods. Freedmen, if guilty of ingratitude towards their former masters, might be again reduced to slavery, though, according to Tacit. Ann. XIII. 26, 27, the practice was discontinued in the reign of Adrian.

4. *Slavery by birth.* The following is the declaration of the civil law: "Slaves are either born such, or become so. They are born such, when they are the slaves of bond-

---

* "Portentosos fœtus extinguimus, liberos quoque, si debiles monstrosique editi sunt, mergimus." — *Sen. de Ira*, Lib. I. Cap. 15.

† "Ex nepte Julia, post damnationem, editum infantem agnosci alique vetuit." — *Suet. Vit. Octav.* LXV. After the death of Germanicus, as an indication of the intensest grief, "partus conjugum expositi." — *Suet. Cal.* V.

‡ "Tantum artes hujus, tantum medicamina possunt,
Quæ steriles facit, atque homines in ventre necandos
Conducit." — *Juv. Sat.* VI. 595.

See also Sen. Consol. ad Helviam. 16, who speaks of the custom as not uncommon. Suet. Vit. Dom. XXII. See the Opus. Academ. of Tzschirner., p. 72, Lip. 1829.

women; and they become slaves, either by the law of nations, that is, by captivity, or by the civil law, which happens, when a free person, above the age of twenty, suffers himself to be sold, for the sake of sharing the price paid for him." Slavery by birth thus depended on the condition of the mother alone, and her master became owner of her offspring, born while she was his property. In order to determine the question of a child's freedom or servitude, the whole period of gestation was taken into view, by the Roman jurists; and if at any time between conception and birth the mother had been for one instant free, the law, by a humane fiction, supposed the birth to have taken place then, and held the infant to be free born.* For fixing the ownership of a child, the date of the birth was alone regarded; and the father of a natural child, by his bondwoman, was the master of his offspring, as much as of any other of his slaves.

We will now proceed to an investigation of the condition of the Roman slaves, first as it was in law, and secondly as it was in fact.

Slavery is defined in the Codex Just., as that by which one man is made subject to another, according to the law of nations, though *contra naturam*, contrary to natural right. "Manumission took its rise from the law of nations, for all men by the law of nature are born in freedom; nor was manumission heard of, while servitude was unknown." "All slaves are in the power of their masters, which power is derived from the law of nations; for it is equally observable among all nations, that masters have had the power of

* "Quia non debet calamitas matris ei nocere, qui in ventre est." Lib. I. Tit. 4, *De Ingen.*

life and death over their slaves; and that whatsoever is acquired by the slave, is acquired for the master." "Servile relations are an impediment to matrimony, as when a father and daughter, or a brother and sister, are manumitted." "The manumission does not change his state, because he had, before manumission, no state or civil condition." "Whatever our slaves have at any time acquired, whether by delivery, stipulation, donation, bequest, or any other means, the same is reputed to be acquired by ourselves, for he who is a slave can have no property. And if a slave is instituted an heir, he cannot otherwise take upon himself the inheritance, than at the command of his master. Masters acquire by their slaves, not only the property of things, but also the possession." "Those persons are allowed to be good witnesses, who are themselves legally capable of taking by testament; but yet no woman, slave, interdicted prodigal, no person under puberty, etc., can be admitted a witness to a testament." "An injury is never understood to be done to the slave; but it is reputed to be done to the master, through the person of his slave. If a man should only give ill language to a slave, or strike him with his fist, the master can bring no action on that account; if a stranger should beat the slave of another in a cruel manner, it is actionable." "Inter servos et liberos matrimonium contrahi non potest; contubernium potest." "A fugitive slave, who is retaken, cannot be manumitted in ten years, contrary to the will of his former master." Under the alarm of great public danger, and during civil wars, slaves were occasionally taken into the ranks of the army, but they were not enlisted before being emancipated.*

* "Octo millia juvenum validorum ex servitiis, prius sciscitantes

The system of Roman polytheism was, at all times, exceedingly tolerant. During the Empire, the introduction of foreign divinities and rites became fashionable. The servile classes followed any religion which they pleased. Rustic masters and their slaves sometimes united in offering up sacrifices to the gods. Slaves were permitted to make offerings to Venus. They were not specially excluded in later times from the great religious solemnities, except the Megalesian plays in honor of Cybele. Public slaves were employed about temples. Female slaves were suffered to participate in some of the mysteries of the Bona Dea. Hercules was the tutelar divinity of slaves, and Juno Feronia presided over their manumission. Public holidays, in all amounting to about thirty in a year, during the existence of paganism, were observed by slaves as well as freemen, with partial cessation from labor. The customary rights of burial were not denied to slaves. Monuments were often erected to their memory, as is proved incontestably by the numerous inscriptions, preserved in Gruter and elsewhere. Slaves were, at all times, permitted to avail themselves of the temporary protection of sanctuaries. These were the temples and altars of the gods, afterwards the palace and images of the emperors, and still later Christian churches and shrines. It was lawful for any person to be the proprietor of slaves; even a slave might hold others of his own class, and act as their master to all intents; but still, those slaves were, as fully as the rest of his *peculium*, subject to the superior rights of his free lord.

---

singulos, vellentne militare, empta publice armaverunt." — *Liv.* XXII. 57. "Ex hoc edicto dati nautæ, armati instructique ab dominis," etc. — *Liv.* XXIV. 11, 17. "Servi, quibus arma darentur, ita ut pretium pro iis bello perfecto dominis solveretur, emebantur." — *Liv.* XXXIV. 6.

The customary allowance of food for each slave was, probably, four Roman bushels (*modius*, one peck English) of manufactured corn a month; monthly supplies being furnished to the upper slaves in the country, and daily rations to those in the city. Gladiators were proverbially well fed ("paratos cibos, ut gladiatoriam saginam," etc. Tac. Hist. II. 88). Salt and oil were commonly allowed, and occasionally vinegar, and salt fish, olives, etc. They had daily what was about an English pint and a half of wine. *Posca*, a mixture of vinegar and water, was given to slaves, as well as to soldiers. Slaves near town procured for themselves other necessaries, and even luxuries.

Male slaves were not permitted by law to wear the *toga*, gown, *bulla*, ball, or the gold ring, which were the badges of citizenship; nor were female slaves suffered to assume the *stola*, the robe of free and modest matrons. The cap, *pileus*, as an emblem of liberty, was probably a forbidden piece of dress. Thus we read: "Servi ad pileum vocati." In most other respects, they were attired as their masters pleased, till the reign of Alexander Severus, who appointed a certain garb for the servile classes. It had been proposed, at a much earlier period, to clothe slaves in a peculiar manner, but the project was abandoned from dread of showing to the slaves the *superiority of their numbers*.*

The laborers on a farm were shut up at night in a building called a work-house, *ergastulum*, but which rather resembled a prison. Each slave had a separate cell.† Some

* "Quantum periculum immineret, si servi nostri numerare nos cœpissent." — *Sen. de Clem.* I. 24. "Galliæ purpuræ tingendæ causa ad servitiorum vestes." — *Plin. Nat. Hist.* XVI. 31.

† "Numerus illi quotidie servorum, velut imperatori exercitus, referebatur; cui jamdudum divitiæ esse debuerant duo vicarii et cella laxior." — *Sen. de. Tranquil. An.* VIII.

masters allowed well-disposed slaves to be better lodged than others.* Suetonius informs us, that it had become so common to expose sick slaves on the isle of Æsculapius in the Tiber, that Claudius enacted a law to prevent the barbarity.† No authoritative regulations seem ever to have been adopted, for limiting the forced labor of slaves within due bounds. Agricultural laborers were probably made to undergo great fatigues. Considerable abatement of toil was made in favor of female slaves, particularly such as had borne three or more children.

Masters were often at great pains to teach their slaves various exercises, trades, arts, and accomplishments; ‡ and even employed hired instructors for this purpose. We have little reason, however, to think that the servile classes generally received any education, in the most limited sense of the term. There was, apparently, no benefit to accrue to the master from his hewers of wood and drawers of water being able to read and write. The obedience of slaves was enforced by severe discipline. The masters availed themselves of the latitude of the law in this respect to the utmost extent. A blow with the hand was a very ready discipline. § The lash and rod were in frequent

* "Reliqua pars lateris hujus servorum libertorumque usibus detinetur, plerisque tam mundis, ut accipere hospites possint." — *Plin. Ep.* II. 17.

† "Omnes, qui exponerentur, liberos esse sanxit, nec redire in ditionem domini, si convaluissent." — *Suet. Vit. Claud.* XXV.

‡ "Literulis Græcis imbutus, idoneus arti
Cuilibet." — *Hor. Ep.* Lib. II. ii. 7.

Donatus says, that Virgil was very partial to two slaves: "Utrumque non ineruditum dimisit, — Alexandrum grammaticum, Cebetem vero et poetam."

§ "Nos colaphum incutimus lambenti crustulo servo." — *Juv.* IX. 5.

use.* If a slave spoke or coughed at a forbidden time, he was flogged by a very severe master.† The toilet of a lady of fashion was a terrible ordeal for a slave. A stray curl was an inexorable offence, and the slave's back was punished for the faults of the mirror.‡ Whips and thongs were not the most dreadful instruments of punishment. Burning alive is mentioned as a punishment in the Pandects and elsewhere. Tertullian says it was first used for slaves alone.§ Vine saplings as instruments of punishment were least dishonorable; next to them rods, *fustes* or *virgæ;* then thongs, *lora;* scourges, *flagella* or *flagra*, sometimes loaded with lead, *plumbata.* Chain scourges were used, with weights at the end, all of bronze or tin. The *equuleus* was a terrible instrument of torture. Dislocation was one of its effects. || There were also the *fidiculæ*, lyre-strings, the *ungula* and *forceps*, etc. A slave taken among soldiers was cast from the Capitoline rock, having been first manumitted, that he might be worthy of that punishment.¶ As slaves could not testify on the rack against their own master, they were sold to others, and thus qualified to testify.**

---

* "Vox domini furit instantis virgamque tenentis." — *Juv.* XIV. 63.

† "Et ne fortuita quidem verberibus excepta sunt, tussis, sternutamentum, singultus," etc. — *Sen. Ep.* XLVII.

‡ "Unus de toto peccaverat orbe comarum
Annulus, incerta non bene fixus acu.
Hoc facinus Lalage speculo, quo viderat, ulta est;
Et cecidit sectis icta Plecusa comis." — *Mart. Lib.* II. *Ep.* 66.

§ "Sed de patibulo et vivi comburio per omne ingenium crudelitatis exhauriat." — *Tert. de Anima*, I.

|| Seneca, Ep. XIX.

¶ Dio Cassius, I. 48, Han. ed. p. 337. 1606.

** Id. LV. 357. Juvenal has this:

"Tum felix, quoties aliquis tortore vocato
Uritur ardenti duo propter lintea ferro.

Cruel masters sometimes hired torturers by profession, or had such persons in their establishments, to assist them in punishing their slaves, or in extorting confessions from them, and many horrible torments were employed for those purposes.* The noses, ears, teeth, or even eyes were in great danger from an enraged master.† Crucifixion was frequently made the fate of a wretched slave, for trifling misconduct, or for mere caprice. ‡ Cato, the Censor, used after supper to seize a thong, and flog such of his slaves as had not attended properly, or had dressed any dish ill. Insulting appellations were given to slaves who had been often subjected to punishment. One who had frequently been beaten was called *mastigia*, or *verbero ;* he who had been branded was termed *stigmatias*, or *stigmatius*, or *inscriptus*, or *literatus*, and he who had borne the *furca* was named *furcifer*. No distinction whatever seems to have been maintained between the modes of punishing male and female slaves. The laws, which abolished the master's power of life and death, appear to have been obeyed with great reluc-

---

Quid suadet juveni lætus stridore catenæ,
Quem mire afficiunt inscripta ergastula, carcer
Rusticus ? " — XIV. 21.

* " — sunt, quæ tortoribus annua præstent." — *Juv.* VI. 480.

† " Trunci naribus auribusque vultus." — *Mart.* II 83. " Peccantis famuli pugno ne percute dentes." — *Id.* XIV. 68.

‡ " Pone crucem servo ; meruit quo crimine servus
Supplicium ? Quis testis adest ? Quis detulit ? Audi.
Nulla unquam de morte hominis cunctatio longa est.
O demens, ita servus homo est ? Nil fecerit, esto ;
Hoc volo, sic jubeo, sit pro ratione voluntas." — *Juv.* VI. 218.
The following law was passed A. C. 58. " Si quis a suis servis interfectus esset, ii quoque, qui testamento manumissi sub eodem tecto mansissent, inter servos supplicia penderent." — *Tac. Ann.* XIII. 32.

tance, and frequently virtually defeated by an increase in the amount of an inferior punishment.

Slaves had various rewards for good conduct held out to them by their masters. The chief of these were manumission, or promotion to a better situation in their owner's service, as to the place of steward, or superintendent. They were sometimes allowed to keep a share of the profits of their business, or money was given them in acknowledgment of special services. Slaves had generally a separate fund called *peculium*, though this was strictly the property of the master. At the *Saturnalia*, slaves were treated like masters, feasting at their owner's tables, having license to say what they pleased without fear of chastisement. Their other principal holidays were the *Matronalia*, in March, *Populifugia*, 7th of July, and *Competalia*, 7th of May.*

* The writings of M. Seneca are full of tender sympathy and of exalted sentiments in behalf of slaves. "Servis," he says, "imperare moderate, laus est; et in mancipio cogitandum est, non quantum illud impune pati possit, sed quantum tibi permittat æqui bonique natura." In the same place, the conduct of Vedius Pollio, who fed his fish with the flesh of his slaves, is reprobated in the severest manner. — *De Clem.* I. 18. In the essay *De Beneficiis*, I. iii. Cap. 19, 20, 21, etc., many instances are recorded of grateful conduct on the part of slaves. "Errat, si quis existimat servitutem in totum hominem descendere; pars melior ejus excepta est. Corpora obnoxia sunt, et adscripta dominis; mens quidem sui juris; quæ adeo libera et vaga est, ut ne ab hoc quidem careere cui inclusa est, teneri queat." One of the examples quoted is where the servant of C. Vettius, "ejus gladium militi ipsi, a quo trahebatur, eduxit, et primum dominum occidit; deinde, *Tempus est*, inquit, *me et mihi consulere, jam dominum manumisi;* atque ita se uno ictu transjecit" (Cap. 23). In the civil wars another slave habited himself like his master, and was slain, while his master escaped. A third, by wise counsel, saved the life of his master, who had spoken treasonable things against Cæsar. The 47th epistle is taken up in describing

The proportion between the sexes of the slaves, has not been ascertained. There were few female agriculturists, and the men who lived in *ergastula* would rarely have wives. Women alone were employed in spinning; but men were, as often as they, engaged in weaving. The sepulchre of the freedmen and slaves of Livia, the daughter of Augustus, as described by Gori, has 150 female names to 400 names of men.

On the whole, we may regard the condition of the slaves in the later days of the Republic, and during the Empire previously to the reign of Constantine, as one of great hardship. Their lot was dependent on the disposition of particular masters, not on the laws, nor on a humane and enlightened public opinion. On a cursory reading of the classical authors, we may form the opinion that slaves in general enjoyed great liberties. But we must recollect that the authors in question were conversant mainly with the *vernæ*, with the house slaves, with the smart, precocious slaves, children brought from Alexandria, with the educated slaves, etc. The groans from the *ergastula* do not reach our ears. We cannot gather up the tears which were shed on the Appian

---

what the treatment of slaves ought to be. Unhappily, he furnishes evidence enough that his compassionate advice was but little heeded. After saying that he will pass over the instances of inhuman men, who treated their slaves more cruelly than beasts, he says: "Alius vini minister in muliebrem modum ornatus, cum ætate luctatur. Non potest effugere pueritiam, sed retrahitur. Jamque militari habitu glaber, destrictis pilis, aut penitus evulsis, tota nocte pervigilat; quam inter ebrietatem domini ac libidinem dividit, et in cubiculo vir, et in convivio puer est." The younger Pliny was a humane master. Dio Cassius, I. 47 of his Roman. Hist., mentions three slaves in the time of Antony's proscription, who saved their masters at the loss of their own lives. One of them was a *stigmaticus*.

Way, around the mausoleum of Augustus, in the countless farms of Italy. There were griefs which we know not of, — sorrows, heart-rending cruelties, which will not be revealed till the day of doom. Slaves were valued only so far as they represented money. Hortensius cared less for the health of his slaves than for that of his fish. It was a question put for ingenious disputation, whether, in order to lighten a vessel in a storm, one should sacrifice a valuable horse or a worthless slave. So late as the reign of Adrian, we find that indications of insanity were not uncommon among slaves, which must generally be attributed to their misery.

The slaves not unfrequently rose in rebellion against their masters. At one time, A. C. 458, Appius Herdonius summoned the slaves from the Capitol with the inspiring words, "Se miserrimi cujusque suscepisse causam, ut servitiis grave jugum demeret." In the city the terror was extreme, as no one knew whom to trust. His foes were they of his own household. A little later, A. C. 415, (Livy, IV. 45,) it was announced that "Servitia, urbem ut incenderent distantibus locis, conjurarunt." At another time, A. C. 271, (Livy, XXII. 33,) twenty-five slaves were affixed to the cross, because they had entered into a conspiracy in the Campus Martius. Etruria, A. C. 196, (Livy, XXXIII. 36,) was threatened with a fearful insurrection. The mournful result was, "Multi occisi, multi capti, alios verberatos crucibus affixit, qui principes conjurationis fuerant; alios dominis restituit." Again, A. C. 184, (Livy, XXXIX. 29,) we read, "Magnus motus servilis eo anno in Apulia fuit." Seven thousand men were condemned. In the brief language of the historian, "de multis sumptum est supplicium."

In A. C. 135, an insurrection of the slaves in Sicily happened, which, says Diodorus, was the most dreadful which

ever occurred. Many towns were plundered; multitudes of persons of both sexes (*ἀναρίθμητοι*) were visited with the direst calamities, and the slaves gained possession of almost the whole island. The insurgents under Eunus amounted to 70,000 men, of whom 20,000 are said to have fallen in the last defeat; and the rest to have been taken and crucified; but they had kept the field for six years, in the face of considerable forces.

In Italy there were vast numbers of slaves, and frequent and dangerous commotions. The first happened at Nuceria, where thirty slaves were taken and executed. In the second insurrection at Capua, 200 slaves rebelled; they were immediately destroyed. The third took place in consequence of the disgraceful conduct of a rich Roman, Titus Minutius by name. Having proclaimed himself king, 3,500 slaves flocked to his standard. Lucius Lucullus was charged with the business of dealing with the insurgents. Minutius, having been betrayed, killed himself, and his associates perished. This was, however, but a prelude to greater troubles in Sicily. The Senate having passed a decree that no freedman among the allies of the Roman people should be reduced to slavery, more than 800 in Sicily, who had been unlawfully deprived of freedom, were liberated. This excited the hopes of the slaves throughout the island. Remonstrances having been made to the prætor, he ordered those who had assembled about him, for the purpose of recovering their liberty, to return to their masters. This was the signal for a general insurrection. The insurgents, having strongly fortified themselves, bade defiance to the efforts of the prætor. A certain Titinius, an outlaw, was their leader. He having at length proved treacherous to his cause, the designs of the conspirators were crushed. Soon,

however, the tumult broke out afresh, and Titinius, who was sent by the prætor against the slaves, was worsted. Their number increased in a few days to more than 6,000. Having chosen a certain Salvius leader, they ravaged various parts of the island. In a battle with the Romans, Salvius took 4,000 prisoners. The whole island was soon in a sad condition. Salvius collected an army of 30,000 men, and assumed all the ensigns of royalty. In this manner the war was protracted for several years, and the disturbances were not fully quelled till after the most vigorous and persevering exertions of the Roman army.*

The famous servile war in Italy, which occurred in the time of Crassus and Pompey, lasted nearly three years, and was not brought to a close without the greatest difficulty. It seems that the slaves lost 105,000 men, exclusive of those who fell in their victories over Lentulus, and other generals; besides, after their main overthrow by Crassus, a body of 5,000 men were vanquished by Pompey.

In A. D. 24, T. Curtisius, a soldier of the pretorian cohort, at Brundusium in Italy, and the neighboring towns, fixed placards on conspicuous places, in which he called on the slaves to assert their rights. His designs were, however, soon crushed, by the unexpected appearance of a fleet. Cinna, Marius, Catiline, and the barbarian invaders of Italy, augmented their forces by promising general freedom to the slaves.†

---

* We have drawn the preceding facts about the servile war from Diodorus Siculus, Lib. XXXVI., where a detailed and impartial statement may be seen. This second rebellion in Sicily lasted three years.

† Plut. Vit. C. Marius; Cicero in Cat. IV. 2; Sallust, Cat. 56. "Servi te reliquerunt. Alium compilaverunt, alium accusaverunt, alium occiderunt, alium prodiderunt, alium calcaverunt, alium veneno, alium criminatione, petierunt." — *Seneca, Ep.* CVII.

Besides the political troubles to which we have alluded, slavery was the fruitful cause of many other evils. The slaves were much addicted to lying, which Plutarch calls the vice of slaves. They were so great thieves, that *fur* was once synonymous with slave.* It came to be said almost proverbially, that slaves were foes.† Female slaves were exposed to so many seductions, and were, at the same time, guarded by so few better influences, that we cannot wonder at their extremely licentious conduct. Slavery fearfully increased dissoluteness in the high ranks of Romans, idleness in the lower ranks, and cruelty in both. The horrid butcheries of the amphitheatre are a sufficient proof of the sanguinary disposition of the Romans.‡ The number of foreign slaves imported from various countries, at too advanced an age to learn the language of their lords, must have tended greatly to corrupt the Latin language.§ The crowds of slaves, assembled in the houses of the rich, were the means of propagating fatal diseases, which frequently ravaged the Roman world.‖

---

* "Exilis domus est, ubi non et multa supersunt,
Et dominum fallunt, et prosunt furibus."

Hor. Ep. Lib. I. vi. 45, 46.

† "Totidem esse hostes, quot servos." — *Sen. Ep.* XLVII.

‡ "Quam hujus amentiæ causam detineam nisi fidei imbecillitatem, pronam semper concupiscentiam secularium gaudiorum?" — *Tertul. ad Uxorem*, Lib. II. Cap. 8. Also *De Spectac.* XXII.

§ "At nunc natus infans delegatur græculæ, ancillæ, cui adjungitur unus aut alter ex omnibus servis, plerumque vilissimus, nec cuiquam serio ministerio accommodatus." — *Tac. de Caus. Corrup.* XXIX.

‖ In Heyne's Opuscula, Vol. III. Prol. 7, is an account of the various *pestes* which desolated Rome. The number mentioned is 33. The sixth, which happened A. U. C. 292, cut off almost all the slaves, and nearly one half of the free population. Liv. XXXVI. Dio-

Such, in brief, was the condition of the Roman world in respect to slavery when our Saviour appeared. Under the first Cæsars, domestic servitude had reached its height of enormity. No part of the immense empire was free from the evil. The Sicilian dungeons were full. Medians, Mœsians, Bithynians, were driven in crowds to the Roman metropolis. Men-stealers were on the alert in the fastnesses of the African Troglodytes. The voice of the slave-auctioneer was heard early and late at Corinth and Delos. From Britain to Parthia, and from the woods of Sweden to the great African desert, the cries of the bondman went up to Heaven. In Judea alone, there seems to have been some alleviation to the picture. Yet there the Romans doubtless transported their slaves as an indispensable part of their domestic arrangement.*

In the Gospels, there is no marked and prominent mention of slavery, though the allusions and incidental notices are not unfrequent. Thus in Matt. viii. 9, δοῦλος in the mouth of the Roman centurion unquestionably means a slave. The military slaves of the Romans were the *armiger*, armor-bearer, *galearius*, helmet-bearer, *clavator*, club-bearer, *calo* and *cacula*, soldier's drudge. In Matt. xiii. 27, 28, perhaps it is the most natural to understand δοῦλος as a slave, though a higher meaning of the word may be included. Also compare Matt. vi. 24; Luke xvi. 13; John viii. 33; xiii. 16; xv. 20. The punishment of the cross, which was inflicted on slaves and the lowest malefactors, was introduced among

nys. IX. 67. In the one which occurred A. D. 69, which lasted only for an autumn, 30,000 funerals were registered, "triginta funerum millia in rationem Libitinæ venerunt." — *Suet. Vit. Nero*, XXXIX.

* King Agrippa exhibited at one time in Judea 700 pairs of gladiators, — *slaves*. — *Jos. Hist.* XIX.

the Jews by the Romans. See also Acts vii. 6. In Rom. vii. 14, we find the expression *πεπραμένος ὑπὸ ἁμαρτίαν*, sold under sin, the bond-slave of sin, referring to the general practice of selling prisoners of war as slaves. They were considered as having lost their title to freedom. Corinth was long the chief slave-mart of Greece, and, from its situation, was likely to have much communication with Brundusium, and the other ports on the eastern side of Italy. Timæus, perhaps with some exaggeration, asserts that Corinth had, in early times, before Athens had reached her supremacy, 460,000 slaves. They were distinguished by the name *chœnix-measurers*. Many of them doubtless embraced the Gospel, when preached by Paul, Apollos, and others. From the language employed by Paul in describing the social condition of the Corinthian converts,* as well as from the development of the particular vices to which they were exposed, we reasonably infer that many slaves were converted. In 1 Cor. vii. 20–24 are the following words: "Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called. Art thou called being a servant? care not for it; but if thou mayest be made free, use it rather. For he that is called in the Lord, being a servant, is the Lord's freeman; likewise also he that is called, being free, is Christ's servant. Ye are bought with a price; be not ye the servants of men. Brethren, let every man, wherein he is called, therein abide with God." The meaning of this passage clearly is, Be not unduly solicitous about being in a state of bondage. If you have a favorable opportunity for gaining

* Βλέπετε γὰρ τὴν κλῆσιν ὑμῶν, ἀδελφοὶ, ὅτι οὐ πολλοὶ σοφοὶ κατὰ σάρκα, οὐ πολλοὶ δυνατοὶ, οὐ πολλοὶ εὐγενεῖς. 1 Cor. i. 26. Also the terms *μωρά, ἀσθενῆ, ἀγενῆ, ἐξουθενημένα, τὰ μὴ ὄντα*, etc.

your freedom, embrace it; it is the preferable state; nevertheless, to be a freeman of Christ is infinitely more important. Your spiritual redemption is purchased at a great price; yield not a servile assent to the authority and opinions of men.*

Eph. vi. 5 – 9, "Servants! be obedient to them that are your masters according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in singleness of your heart, as unto Christ; not with eye-service, as men-pleasers; but as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart; with good-will doing service, as to the Lord, and not to men; knowing that whatsoever good thing any man doeth, the same shall he receive of the Lord, whether he be bond or free. And, ye masters! do the same things unto them, forbearing threatening: knowing that your Master also is in heaven; neither is there respect of persons with him." That slaves are here referred to is unquestionable, — from the contrast, in v. 8, between δοῦλος and ἐλεύθερος. Both masters and slaves are charged to perform their respective duties faithfully and kindly, as accountable alike to God. Col. iii. 22, 25, and iv. 1, are of similar import. Slaves were numerous in Colosse, in Ephesus, and in all the principal cities of Asia Minor. A principal fault in the slaves seems to have been, a faithless performance of duty in the absence of their masters. Col. iv. 1 prescribes τὸ δίκαιον τὴν ἰσότητα, kind treatment, such as is

* That δοῦλος, v. 22, means a slave, one in actual bondage, is made altogether certain by its being in contrast with ἐλεύθερος γενέσθαι, as well as by the whole spirit of the passage. There would be no sense in directing *hired* servants to change their condition, if they could. After χρῆσαι, v. 21, understand ἐλευθερίᾳ, not δουλείᾳ, as the old commentators think. V. 23, τιμῆς is used in a spiritual sense, with reference to the price which is paid for human freedom.

becoming Christian masters. That it cannot mean the legal enfranchisement of the slave is clear; for why, in that case, were any directions given to the slaves, if the relation was not to continue? 1 Tim. vi. 1, 2, "Let as many servants as are under the yoke count their own masters worthy of all honor, that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed. And they that have believing masters, let them not despise them, because they are brethren; but rather do them service, because they are faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit." Then follows, v. 3–5, an exhortation to Timothy to withdraw himself from persons who taught a contrary doctrine, and who were employing themselves in useless logomachies. The word "yoke," in 1 Tim. vi. 1, denotes a servile condition; as in Lev. xxvi. 13, "I have broken the bands of your yoke." It seems that the honor of the Gospel was concerned in the rendering, on the part of the slave, of a prompt obedience to the commands of his master. Titus ii. 4, 10, is of kindred meaning. The vices of pilfering and petulance are particularly mentioned. Crete was full of slaves from the earliest times to which history carries us.

Onesimus, the subject of Paul's Epistle to Philemon, was the slave of Philemon, a Colossian, who had been made a Christian through the ministry of Paul. He absconded from his master, for a reason which is not fully explained. In the course of his flight he met with Paul at Rome, by whom he was converted, and ultimately recommended to the favor of his old master. It may be observed that Paul would, under any circumstances, have had no choice, but to send Onesimus to his master; the detention of a fugitive slave was considered the same offence as theft, and would no doubt incur liability to prosecution for damages. Runaways appre-

hended and unreclaimed were sold by order of the *præfectus vigilum*, if not liberated by the Emperor. In later times, a runaway, guiltless of other offences, was not punished for the sake of public justice, but was restored to his owner.

1 Pet. ii. 18: "Servants, be subject to your masters with all fear; not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward." The word οἰκέται is here employed. This word denotes any one under the authority of another, particularly household servants, *vernæ*, *familia*, *domestici*, *famuli*. It is used but four times in the New Testament: in this passage; in Luke xvi. 13; Acts x. 7; Rom. xiv. 4. In all these passages, the presumption is that slaves are intended, as they almost universally performed the duties which are now performed by hired servants. The ἀνδραποδιστής, the slave-trader, is classed, 1 Tim. i. 10, with the most abandoned sinners. Slave-dealing was not esteemed an honorable occupation, or worthy of merchants, by the Romans;* and those who followed it, *mangores*, *venalitiarii*, sometimes gave themselves an air of much consequence, trusting to their wealth, and the means of gratifying competition for the abominable though precious objects of their traffic.†

Though the Christian religion did not by direct precept put an end to the iron servitude which prevailed in the Roman Empire, yet its whole spirit and genius are adverse to slavery, and it was the most powerful of all the causes, which were set in operation, and which finally extinguished

---

* "Mercator urbibus prodest, medicus ægris, mango venalibus; sed omnes isti, quia ad alienum commodum pro suo veniunt, non obligant eos quibus prosunt." — *Sen. de Benef.* IV. 13. "Radix est bulbacea, mangonicis venalitiis pulchre nota, quæ e vino dulci illita pubertatem coercet." — *Plin. Nat. Hist.* XXI. 97, and XXXII. 47.

† See Suet. Aug. 69; Macrob. Saturn, II. 4; Pliny, LXXI. 12; Mart. VIII. 13.

the system throughout Europe. 1. It raised the worth of the human mind. It fully established its dignity and immortality. It poured a new light on the murderous *arena*, and on all the horrid forms of destroying life which prevailed. 2. It proclaimed the doctrine of universal love. It placed charity, kindness, and compassion among the cardinal virtues; and took away from a man all hope of salvation, unless he forgave heartily all who might have injured him. 3. It proclaimed a common Redeemer for the whole human race. It declared that in Christ, barbarian, Scythian, bond and free were on an entire equality. 4. It taught men the value of time, made them industrious, temperate, and frugal, and thus took away the supposed necessity for servile labor. 5. It commanded all its disciples to engage personally in the great work of propagating the religion among all nations. This very enterprise of course embraced the millions of slaves.

We are now prepared briefly to consider the influence which Christianity exerted in the mitigation and final extinction of slavery. One of the Apostolical Canons is in the following words: "Servi in clerum non promoveantur citra dominorum voluntate; hoc ipsum operatur redhibitionem. Si quando vero servus quoque gradu ecclesiastico dignus videatur, qualis noster Onesimus apparuit, et domini consenserint, manuque emiserint, et domo sua ablegaverint; efficitor." In chap. 2 of the Epistle of Ignatius of Antioch to Polycarp of Smyrna is the following: "Overlook not the men and maid servants; neither let them be puffed up; but rather let them be the more subject to the glory of God, that they may obtain from him a better liberation. Let them not desire to be set free at the public cost, that they be not slaves to their own lusts." In the

general Epistle of Barnabas, chap. xiv. ver. 15, "Thou shalt not be bitter in thy commands towards any of thy servants that trust in God; lest thou chance not to fear him who is over both; because he came not to call any with respect of persons, but whomsoever the Spirit prepared."

A warm sympathy was felt, it seems, by many of the primitive Christians, in behalf of the slaves. Clemens, in his Epistle to the Corinthians, remarks: "We have known many among ourselves, who have delivered themselves into bonds and slavery, that they might restore others to their liberty; many, who have hired out themselves servants unto others, that by their wages they might feed and sustain them that wanted." Paulinus, Bishop of Nola, expended his whole estate, and then sold himself, in order to accomplish the same object. Serapion sold himself to a stage-player, and was the means of converting him and his family. Ambrose (Off. I. 2) enjoins that great care should be taken of those in bondage. Cyprian (Ep. LX.) sent to the Bishop of Numidia, in order to redeem some captives, 2,500 crowns. Socrates, the historian, says, that after the Romans had taken 7,000 Persian captives, Acacius, Bishop of Amida, melted the gold and silver plate of his church, with which he redeemed the captives. Ambrose of Milan did the same in respect to the furniture of his church. It was the only case in which the imperial constitutions allowed plate to be sold.

During the early persecutions, reduction to slavery, in a very horrid form, was employed as a punishment for the embracing of the faith. Female Christians were often condemned to be given up as slaves to the keepers of public brothels in Rome, in order to be subjected to open prostitution. Such was the fate of Agnes, of whom Ambrose thus

speaks: "Insanus judex jussit eam expoliari, et nudam ad lupanar duci, sub voce præconis dicentis, Agnem sacrilegam virginem Diis blasphemia inferentem scortum lupanaribus doctum." * Her offence was her refusal to worship Vesta. Lactantius has the remark, that, if any slave became a Christian, all hope of freedom was taken away.

These severe enactments were in some measure neutralized by the compassionate treatment of the Church. After the establishment of Christianity, under Constantine, slaves partook of all the ordinances of religion; † and their birth was no impediment to their rising to the highest dignities of the priesthood. Slaves holding the true faith were sometimes taken into the service of the Church. ‡ At first, indeed, it was required that a slave should be enfranchised before ordination; but Justinian declared the simple consent of the master to be sufficient. If a slave had been ordained without his master's knowledge, the latter might demand him within a year, and the slave fell back into his master's power. If a slave, after ordination, with his master's consent, chose to renounce the ecclesiastical state, and returned to a secular life, he was given back as a slave to his master. It was common for the patrons of churches,

---

* Ambr. Serm. Tertullian, Apol., Cap. L.: "Nam et proxime ad lenonem damnando, Christianum, potius quam ad leonem," etc. August. de Civit. Dei, I. 26: "Sed quædam sanctæ feminæ tempore persecutionis, ut insectatores suæ pudicitiæ devitarent, in rapturum atque necaturum se fluvium projecerunt." Lactantius also says, Vol. II. p. 214: "Fidelissimi quique servi contra dominos vexabantur."

† Paul mentions slaves having been baptzed, 1 Cor. xii. 13, εἴτε δοῦλοι, εἴτε ἐλεύθεροι — ἐβαπτίσθημεν, etc.

‡ "Quo magis necessarium credidi, ex duabus ancillis, *quæ ministræ dicebantur*, quid esset veri, et per tormenta quærere." — *Plin. Ep.* X. 97.

till the fifth century, to encourage their slaves to become clergymen, that they, in preference to strangers, might receive their benefices. Slaves were fully protected, in the exercise of worship, and, to a certain extent, in the observance of religious festivals. The liberty and gambols of the *Saturnalia* were transferred to Christmas. If a Christian slave fell into the hands of a heathen master, the latter was prohibited from interfering with his spiritual concerns. Judaism was looked upon with such horror, that any Christian was entitled to force a Jewish master to sell to him a Christian slave.

Augustus restrained the right of indiscriminate and unlimited manumission. Antoninus empowered the judge, who should be satisfied about the slave's complaint of ill treatment, to force the master to sell him to some other owner. The master's power of life and death over his slaves was first sought to be legally abolished by Adrian and Antoninus Pius. Constantine placed the wilful murder of a slave on a level with that of a freeman, and expressly included the case of a slave who died under punishment, unless it was inflicted with the usual instruments of correction. The effect of this humane law was, however, done away by a subsequent enactment of Constantine. Several councils of the Church endeavored to repress slave-murder, by threatening the perpetrators with temporary excommunication.* Adrian suppressed the work-houses for the confinement of slaves. Several humane laws were enacted by Constantine in relation to the separation of families. One directs that property shall be so divided, "ut

* "Et in pluribus quidem conciliis statutum est, excommunicationi, vel pœnitentiæ biennii, esse subjiciendum, qui servum proprium sine conscientiâ judicis occidint." — *Muratori.*

integra apud possessorem unumquemque servorum agnatio permaneat." Another law says, "ut integra apud successorem unumquemque servorum, vel colonorum adscriptitiæ conditionis, seu inquilinorum proximorum agnatio, vel adfinitas permaneat." A Christian church afforded very great safety from the wrath of unmerciful owners; for when a slave took refuge there, it became the duty of the ecclesiastics to intercede for him with his master, and, if the latter refused to pardon the slave, they were bound not to give him up, but to let him live within the precincts of the sanctuary, till he chose to depart, or his owner granted him forgiveness. In Christian times, the ceremony of manumission,* which was performed in church, particularly at Easter, and other festivals of religion, was considered the most regular mode of emancipation, and came to displace, in a great measure, the other forms. This mode was introduced and regulated by three laws of Constantine; † but it was not

* The different modes of manumission were the following: 1. *Vindicta*, the pronouncing of a form of words by the owner before the prætor. 2. *Census*, enrolment in the censor's books. 3. *Testamentum*, by will. 4. *Epistolam*, by letter. 5. *Per convivium*, at the banquet. 6. By the master designedly calling the slave his son. 7. By actual adoption. 8. Leave given to a slave to subscribe his name as witness. 9. Attiring a slave in the insignia of a freeman, etc.

† The following is the rescript of Constantine: "Qui religiosa mente in ecclesiæ gremio servulis suis meritam concesserint libertatem, eandem eodem jure donasse videantur, quo civitas Romana solennitatibus decursis dari consuevit. Sed hoc duntaxat iis, qui sub aspectu antistitum dederint, placuit relaxari. Clericis autem amplius concedimus, ut, cum suis famulis tribuunt libertatem, non solum in conspectu ecclesiæ ac religiosi populi plenum fructum libertatis concessisse dicantur, verum etiam cum postremo judicio libertates dederint, seu quibuscunque verbis dari præceperint; ita ut ex die publicatæ voluntatis, sine aliquo juris teste vel interprete, competat directa libertas."

adopted over the whole Empire at once, as, nearly one hundred years afterwards, the Council of Carthage, A. D. 401, resolved to ask of the Emperor authority to manumit in church. The request was granted. Augustine, in one of his sermons, mentions the formalities thus observed in conferring freedom.* After the establishment of Christianity as a national religion, when heresy came to be dreaded as much as treason, the testimony of slaves was received equally in respect to matters relating to their own interests and to those of their masters. The Church did not openly maintain the validity of slave nuptials for many years. Attempts of free persons to form marriages with slaves were severely punished.† Justinian removed most of the obstacles which preceding emperors had placed in the way of manumission. Slavery did not cease, however, till a comparatively late period. ‡

* Augustine, in another place, holds the following language: "Non oportet Christianum possidere servum quomodo equum aut argentum. Quis dicere audeat, ut vestimentum eum debere contemni? Hominem namque homo tamquam seipsum diligere debet, cui ab omnium Domino, ut inimicos diligat, imperatur."

† "The Emperor Basilius allowed slaves to marry, and receive the priestly benediction; but this having been disregarded, Alexius Comnenus renewed the permission. It seems to have been thought either that the benediction gave freedom, or ought to be followed by it." — *Blair*. See Justin. Græco-Roman. Lib. II. 5.

‡ The authorities on the general subject, which we have consulted, are the different codes of Roman law; Gibbon; two Essays of M. de Burigny, in Vols. XXXV. and XXXVII. of Mémoires de l'Academie des Inscriptions; and Blair's Inquiry into the State of Slavery among the Romans, Edinburgh, 1833, a valuable work. In nearly all the facts which we have quoted from him, we have referred to the original authorities. We have made a personal examination of nearly all the extant Latin authors, including the historians of Byzantium, and the early writers and fathers of the Christian Church.

SLAVERY IN THE MIDDLE AGES.*

BEFORE the conclusion of the fifth century, the Roman Empire in all the West of Europe was overthrown by the Northern barbarous nations. The Vandals were masters of Africa; the Suevi held part of Spain; the Visigoths held the remainder, with a large portion of Gaul; the Burgundians occupied the provinces watered by the Rhone and Saone; the Ostrogoths, nearly the whole of Italy. Among these barbarous nations involuntary servitude, in various forms, seems to have existed. Tacitus de Moribus Germanorum, XXV., says: "The slaves in general were not arranged at their several employments in the household affairs, as is the practice at Rome. Each has his separate habitation, and his own establishment to manage. The master considers him as an agrarian dependent, who is obliged to furnish a certain quantity of grain, of cattle, or of wearing-apparel. The slave obeys, and the state of servitude extends no further." All domestic affairs are managed by the master's wife and children. To punish a slave with stripes,

* This Essay was originally published in the Biblical Repository for January, 1836.

to load him with chains, to condemn him to hard labor, is unusual. It is true, that slaves are, sometimes, put to death, not under color of justice, or of any authority vested in the master, but in a transport of passion, in a fit of rage, as is often the case in a sudden affray; but it is also true, that this species of homicide passes with impunity. The freedmen are not of much higher consideration than the actual slaves. They obtain no rank in the master's family, and, if we except the parts of Germany where monarchy is established, they never figure on the stage of public business. In despotic governments, they rise above the men of ingenuous birth, and even eclipse the whole body of nobles. In other states, the subordination of the freedmen is a proof of public liberty." It is not easy to determine whether liberty most flourished in Germany, or Gaul. In the latter the influence of religion was much greater, while in the former there was more individual independence. In Gaul, however, manumission was much more frequent, the slaves being made free, in order that they might, on any emergency, be able to assist their lords, who had not, like the German barons, freeborn warriors always at hand to assist them. In Gaul, the Church had a much greater number of slavès; and under the influence of Christianity slavery is always sure to be mitigated.

In the various ancient codes of law,* the first thing which strikes us is the distinction of social ranks. The fundamental one is that of freemen and slaves. Besides the slaves who become so by birth, or the fortune of war, anciently any freeman could dispose of his own liberty: if he mar-

* Such as the Lex Salica, the Code of the Ripuarii, Code of the Burgundians, Lex Saxonum, etc.

ried a female slave, he incurred the same penalty; if unable to pay his debts, he became the bondsman of his creditors. The code of the Lombards in Italy seems, in some respects, to have been peculiarly rigorous. For him who slew his own slave no punishment was provided; but no composition would atone for the life of the slave who assassinated a freeman. If a slave presumed to marry a freewoman, the doom of both was death; but the freeman might marry his maiden, provided he previously enfranchised her. Such unions were, however, regarded as disgraceful. The slave had little hope of escape. Enfranchisement was far from frequent, and the *libertus* was as dependent on his patron, as the slave on his owner; neither could marry beyond his own caste without incurring the penalty of death; yet marriage was all but obligatory, that servitude might be perpetuated. Manumission generally took place in the churches, or by will, or by a written instrument; and these three modes were also common to the Romans; but there were other modes peculiar to certain nations. In France, it was effected by striking a *denarius* from the hands of the slave, or by opening the door for him to escape. The Lombards delivered him to one man, this man delivered him to a third, the third to a fourth, who told him he had leave to go east, west, north, or south. The owner might also deliver his slave to the king, that the king might deliver him to the priest, who might manumit him at the altar. Among the Lombards, the symbol was sometimes an arrow, which, being delivered to the slave, betokened that he was now privileged to bear arms, — the distinguishing characteristic of freedom.* The condition of the *liberti* varied; those

* See Muratori's Ital. Scriptor. Rerum, Vol. I. Pars ii. p. 90.

who were emancipated before the altar were exempted from every species of dependence. The same may be said of the *manumissio per denarium*, *per quartam manum*, *per portas patentes;* but if *per chartam*, the *libertus* obtained a much less share of freedom; if he escaped from personal, he was still subject to other service, and to the jurisdiction of his late owner. The rustic freedman seldom possessed any land, and if he removed, as his new condition allowed him, to any city or town, he was still bound by an annual return to his patron. He could not depose in a court of justice to that patron's prejudice, nor marry without his consent. The *ingenuus*, who enjoyed freedom without any civil dignity, and who was privileged to carry arms, often engaged himself as the client of some chief, with whom he fought during war, and administered justice during peace; if no client, he was still liable to military service, and to assist in the local courts. Among the Salian Franks, if a freeman married a slave, he became a slave. The Ripuarians were still more severe; the woman who had married a slave was offered, by the local judge or court, a sword and a spindle; if she took the former, she must kill her husband; if the latter, she must embrace servitude with him. Greater severity still was found among the Burgundians, Visigoths, and Lombards. Among the Saxons, says Adam of Bremen, it is commanded that no unequal marriages be contracted, — that noble marry with noble, freeman with freewoman, freedman with freedwoman, slave with slave; for if any one should marry out of his condition, he is punished with death. A criminal leniency towards crimes committed against slaves, and great severity towards crimes committed by that unfortunate class, characterize more or less all the German codes. By the Lex

Saxonum, the mulct for the murder of a noble was 1440 sols to the kindred, besides a fine to the State ; for that of a freedman, 120 ; for that of a slave by a noble, 36 ; but by a freedman an oath of compurgation sufficed.

The perpetual wars in which these nations were engaged, greatly increased the number of slaves. The Goth, the Burgundian, or the Frank, who returned from a successful expedition, dragged after him a long train of sheep, of oxen, and of human captives, whom he treated with the same brutal contempt. The youths of an elegant form were set apart for the domestic service ; a doubtful situation, which alternately exposed them to the favorable or cruel impulse of passion. The useful smiths, carpenters, cooks, gardeners, etc. employed their skill for the benefit of their masters. But the Roman captives, who were destitute of art, but capable of labor, were condemned, without regard to their former condition, to tend the cattle, and cultivate the lands of the barbarians. The number of the hereditary bondsmen, who were attached to the Gallic estates, was continually increased by new supplies. When the masters gave their daughters in marriage, a train of useful servants, chained on the wagons to prevent their escape, was sent as a nuptial present into a distant country. The Roman laws protected the liberty of each citizen against the rash effects of his own distress or despair. But the subjects of the Merovingian kings might alienate their personal freedom.* From the reign of Clovis, during five successive centuries, the laws and manners of Gaul uniformly tended to promote the increase and to confirm the duration of personal servitude.

* "Licentiam habeatis mihi qualemcunque volueritis disciplinam ponere ; vel venumdare, aut quod vobis placuerit de me facere."

In a later age, and during the prevalence of the feudal system, the lower class of the population may be considered under three divisions. 1. *Freemen*, distinguished among the writers of the Middle Ages as *Arimanni*, *Conditionales*, *Originarii*, *Tributales*, etc. These persons possessed some small allodial property of their own, and, besides that, cultivated some farm belonging to their more wealthy neighbors, for which they paid a fixed rent, and likewise bound themselves to perform several small services. These were properly free persons; yet such was the spirit of oppression cherished by the great landholders, that many freemen in despair renounced their liberty, and voluntarily surrendered themselves as slaves to their powerful masters. This they did in order that their masters might become more immediately interested to afford them protection, together with the means of subsisting themselves and their families. It was still more common for freemen to surrender their liberty to bishops or abbots, that they might partake of the security which the vassals and slaves of monasteries and churches enjoyed.

2. *Villani.* They were likewise *adscripti glebæ* or *villæ*, from which they derived their name. They differed from slaves in that they paid a fixed rent to their master for the land which they cultivated, and, after paying that, all the fruits of their labor and industry belonged to themselves in property. They were, however, precluded from selling the lands on which they dwelt. Their persons were bound, and their masters might reclaim them, at any time, in a court of law, if they strayed. In England, at least from the reign of Henry II., the *villeins* were incapable of holding property, and destitute of redress, except against the most outrageous injuries. Their tenure bound them to what were called *villein-services*, such as the felling of timber,

the carrying of manure, and the repairing of roads. But by the customs of France and Germany, persons in this abject state seem to have been serfs, and distinguished from villeins, who were only bound to fixed payments and duties.*

3. *Servi.* The masters of slaves had absolute power over their persons, and could inflict punishment when they pleased, without the intervention of a judge. They possessed this dangerous right, not only in the more early periods, when their manners were fierce, but it continued as late as the twelfth century. Even after this jurisdiction of masters came to be restrained, the life of a slave was deemed to be of so little value, that a very slight compensation atoned for taking it away. In cases where culprits who were freemen were punished by fine, slaves were punished corporeally. Slaves might be put to the rack on very slight occasions. During several centuries after the barbarous nations embraced Christianity, slaves who lived together as husband and wife were not joined together by any religious ceremony, and did not receive the nuptial benediction from a priest. When this connection came to be considered as lawful marriage, the slaves were not permitted to marry without the consent of their masters; and such as ventured to do so, without obtaining this consent, were punished with great severity, and sometimes were put to death. Afterwards, such delinquents were subjected only to a fine. All the children of slaves were in the same condition with their parents, and became the property of their masters. Slaves

* See Ducange on the words *Villanus*, *Servus*, *Obnoxatio*. Also Hallam's Middle Ages, Vol. I. p. 121, and a note in Vol. I. of Robertson's Charles V.

were so entirely the property of their master, that he could sell them at pleasure. While domestic slavery continued, property in a slave was sold in the same manner precisely in which property in any other movable was sold. Afterwards, slaves became *adscripti glebæ*, and were conveyed by sale, together with the farm or estate to which they belonged. Slaves had a title to nothing but subsistence and clothes from their master. If they had any *peculium*, or fixed allowance for their subsistence, they had no right of property in what they saved out of that. All which they accumulated belonged to their master. Slaves were distinguished from freemen by a peculiar dress. Among all the barbarous nations long hair was a mark of dignity and freedom. Slaves were for that reason obliged to shave their heads, and thus they were constantly reminded of their own inferiority. For the same reason, it was enacted in the laws of almost all the nations of Europe, that no slave should be admitted to give evidence against a freeman in a court of justice.*

When charters of liberty or manumission were granted to persons in servitude, they contained four concessions corresponding with the four capital grievances to which men in

---

* Ducange, under the word *Servus*, mentions, among others, the following classes of slaves: Of the field; *beneficiarii;* attached to the soil, *adscripti glebæ; censuales servi civitatis*, public slaves; *servi comitum; consuetudinarii*, a species of serfs; *ecclesiastici*, belonging to the Church; *fiscales*, connected with the royal treasury; *fugitivi; servi fundorum; gregarii; massari*, a species of serfs; *ministeriales*, domestics employed in and about the house, of whom twenty classes are enumerated; *palatii; servi pœnæ; stipendiarii; testamentales; tributarii; triduani*, who served three days for themselves, and three for their masters; *vicarii*, who performed in the country-seats duties for their masters, etc.

bondage are subject: — 1. The right of disposing of their persons by sale or grant was relinquished. 2. Power was given to them of conveying their property and effects by will or any other legal deed. Or if they happened to die intestate, it was provided that their property should go to their lawful heirs, in the same manner as the property of other persons. 3. The services and taxes which they owed to their superior, which had been previously arbitrary and imposed at pleasure, were precisely ascertained. 4. They were allowed the privilege of marrying according to their own inclination. Many circumstances combined to effect this deliverance for the slaves. The spirit and precepts of the Christian religion were of great efficacy. Christians became so sensible of the inconsistency of their conduct with their professions, that to set a slave free was deemed an act of highly meritorious piety. "The humane spirit of the Christian religion," says Dr. Robertson, "struggled long with the maxims and customs of the world, and contributed more than any other circumstance to introduce the practice of manumission." * A great part of the charters of manumission previously to the reign of Louis X. were granted "pro amore Dei, pro remedio animæ, et pro mercede animæ." The formality of manumission was executed in church, as a religious solemnity. The person to be set free was led

* When Pope Gregory, towards the end of the sixth century, granted liberty to some of his slaves, he introduces this reason for it: "Cum Redemptor noster, totius conditor naturæ, ad hoc propitiatus humanam carnem voluerit assumere, ut divinitatis suæ gratia, dirempto (quo tenebatur captivus) vinculo, pristinæ nos restitueret libertati; salubriter agitur, si homines, quos ab initio liberos natura protulit, et jus gentium jugo substituit servitutis, in ea, qua nati fuerant, manumittentis beneficio, libertate reddantur."

round the great altar with a torch in his hand; he took hold of the horns of the altar, and there the solemn words of conferring liberty were pronounced. Another method of obtaining liberty was by entering into holy orders, or taking the vow in a monastery. This was permitted for some time, but so many slaves escaped, by this means, out of the hands of their masters, that the practice was afterwards restrained, and at last prohibited by the laws of most of the nations of Europe. Princes, on the birth of a son, or other joyous event, enfranchised a certain number of slaves as a testimony of gratitude to God. There are several kinds of manumission published by Marculfus, and all of them are founded on religious considerations, in order to procure the favor of God, or to obtain the forgiveness of sins. Mistaken ideas concerning religion induced some persons to relinquish their liberty. The *oblati*, or voluntary slaves of churches or monasteries, were very numerous. Great, however, as the power of religion was, it does not appear that the enfranchisement of slaves was a very frequent practice while the feudal system maintained its ascendency. The inferior order of men owed the recovery of their liberty in part to the decline of that aristocratical policy, which lodged the most extensive power in the hands of a few members of the society, and depressed all the rest. When Louis X. issued his ordinance, some slaves had been so long accustomed to servitude, that they refused to accept of the freedom which was offered to them. Long after the reign of Louis X., several of the ancient nobility continued to exercise dominion over their slaves. In some instances when the prædial slaves were declared to be freemen, they were still bound to perform certain services to their ancient masters, and were kept in a state different from other subjects,

being restricted either from purchasing land, or becoming members of a community within the precincts of the manor to which they formerly belonged.

Slavery seems to have existed among our English ancestors from the earliest times. The anecdote respecting the *Angli* found in Rome by Pope Gregory, is well known. The Anglo-Saxons, in their conquests, probably found, and certainly made, a great number of slaves. The posterity of these men inherited the lot of their fathers. Many free-born Saxons, on account of debt, want, or crime, lost their liberty. The enslavement of a freeman was performed before a competent number of witnesses. The unhappy man laid on the ground his sword and lance, the symbols of the free; took up the bill and the goad, the implements of slavery; and, falling on his knees, placed his head, in token of submission, under the hands of his master. In the more ancient laws, we find various classes of slaves. The most numerous class were the *villani*. All were, however, forbidden to carry arms, were subjected to ignominious punishments, and might be branded and whipped according to law.* In the charter, by which one Harold of Buckenhale gives his manor of Spalding to the Abbey of Croyland, he enumerates among its appendages, Colgrin his bailiff, Harding his smith, Lefstan his carpenter, Elstan his fisherman, Osmund his miller, and nine others, who were probably husbandmen; and these, with their wives and children, their

* In the reign of Athelstan, a man-thief was ordered to be stoned to death by twenty of his fellows, each of whom was punished with three whippings, if he failed thrice to hit the culprit. A woman-thief was burned by eighty women-slaves, each of whom brought three billets of wood to the execution. If either failed, she was likewise whipped.

goods and chattels, and the cottages in which they lived, he transfers in perpetual possession to the Abbey. The sale and purchase of slaves prevailed during the whole of the Anglo-Saxon period. The toll in the market of Lewes was one penny for the sale of an ox, four pennies for that of a slave. On the importation of foreign slaves no impediment had ever been imposed. The export of native slaves was forbidden under severe penalties. But habit and avarice had taught the Northumbrians to bid defiance to all the efforts of the legislature. They even carried off their relations, and sold them as slaves in the ports of the Continent. The men of Bristol were the last to abandon this traffic. Their agents travelled into every part of the country; they were instructed to give the highest price for females in a state of pregnancy; and the slave-ships regularly sailed from that port to Ireland, where they were secure of a ready and profitable market. At last, Wulstan, Bishop of Worcester, visited Bristol several years successively, resided for months in the neighborhood, and preached every Sunday against the barbarity and irreligion of the slave-dealers. The merchants were convinced by his reasons, and in their guild solemnly bound themselves to renounce the trade. The perfidy of one of the members was punished with the loss of his eyes. The influence of religion considerably mitigated the hardships of the slaves. The bishop was the appointed protector of the slaves in his diocese. The masters were frequently admonished, that slaves and freemen were of equal value in the eyes of the Almighty; that all had been redeemed at the same price; and that the master would be judged with the same rigor which he had exercised towards his dependents. The prospect of obtaining their freedom was a powerful stimulus to their industry and good

behavior. When the celebrated Wilfred had received from Edelevaleh, king of Sussex, the donation of the isles of Selsey, with two hundred and fifty slaves, the bishop instructed them in the Christian faith, baptized them, and immediately made them free. In most of the wills which are still extant, we meet with directions for granting liberty to a certain number of slaves, especially such as had been reduced to slavery by the *wite theow*, a judicial sentence. Their manumission, to be legal, was to be performed in the market, in the court of the hundred, or in the church.

In the abstract of the population of England in the Doomsday Book, at the close of the reign of William the Conqueror, the whole population is stated at 283,242, of which the *servi* are 25,156; *ancillæ*, 467; *bordarii*, 82,119; *villani*, 108,407; total, 216,149; leaving for the remaining classes, 67,093. The *servi* of the Norman period, says Bishop Kennett, might be the pure *villani*, and *villani in gross*, who without any determined tenure of land were, at the arbitrary pleasure of the lord, appointed to servile works, and received their wages and maintenance at the discretion of their lord. We have the authority of Bracton for asserting that, however unhappy the condition of the *servi* was in other respects, yet their lives and limbs were under the protection of the laws; so that if the master killed his bondman, he was subject to the same punishment as if he had killed any other person. The form of emancipation of the *servi* is minutely described in the laws of the Conqueror. The *ancillæ* were female slaves under circumstances nearly similar to the *servi*. Their chastity was in some measure protected by law. The *bordarii* were distinct from the *servi* and *villani*, and seem to be those of a less servile condition, who had a bord or cottage with a small parcel of

land, on condition that they should supply the master with eggs, poultry, etc., as very necessary for his *board* and entertainment. Brady says, "they were drudges and performed vile services, which were reserved by the lord upon a poor little house, and a small parcel of land."* The *villani* have already been described.

There seems to have been no general law for the emancipation of slaves in the statute-book of England. Though the genius of the English constitution favored personal liberty, yet servitude continued long in England, in particular places. In the year 1514, we find a charter of Henry VIII., enfranchising two slaves belonging to one of his manors. As late as 1547, there is a commission from Elizabeth with respect to the manumission of certain slaves belonging to her.

In Italy, in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, the number of slaves began to decrease. Early in the fifteenth century, a writer quoted by Muratori speaks of them as no longer existing. The greater part of the peasants in some countries of Germany had acquired their liberty before the end of the thirteenth century. In other parts, as well as in the northern and eastern portions of Europe, they remain in a sort of *villenage* to this day. In France, after innumerable particular instances of manumission had taken place, Louis Hutin, by a general edict in 1315, asserting that his kingdom is denominated the kingdom of the *Franks*, that he would have the fact correspond to the name, emancipates all persons in the royal domains upon paying a just composition, as an example for other lords possessing *villeins* to follow. Philip

* See General Introduction to the Doomsday Book, by Sir Henry Ellis, principal Librarian of the British Museum, 2 vols., 1833.

the Long renewed the same edict three years afterwards, a proof that the edict of Louis had not been carried into execution. Prædial servitude was not abolished in all parts of France till the Revolution. In 1615, the *Tiers Etat* prayed the king to cause all serfs to be enfranchised, on paying a composition; but this was not complied with, and they continued to exist in many provinces. Throughout almost the whole jurisdiction of the parliament of Besançon, the peasants were attached to the soil, not being capable of leaving it without the lord's consent; in some places he even inherited their goods, in exclusion of their kindred. Voltaire mentions an instance of his interfering in behalf of a few wretched slaves of Franche Compté. About the middle of the fifteenth century, some Catalonian serfs, who had escaped into France, being claimed by their lords, the parliament of Toulouse declared that every man who entered the kingdom, *encriant France*, should be free.

On a review of the subject of slavery during the period in question, we find: —

1. That Christianity had done much to abolish slavery, as it existed in the Roman Empire in the time of Constantine and his more immediate successors. The spirit of the Christian religion effected a glorious triumph in almost every portion of the imperial dominions. There was no instantaneous abandonment of the system of servitude. There was no royal edict which crushed the thing at once. But its contrariety to the precepts of the New Testament was gradually seen. Clergymen vindicated the rights of the oppressed. The codes of slave law were ameliorated, till finally the rescripts of Justinian nearly completed the salutary reform.

2. During the last years of the Roman Empire an unfortunate change was going on, which was destined once more to revive the system. The *middle class* in society was dwindling away. A few distinguished families swallowed up the moderate landholders, or drove them out of the country. A large class of hungry and spiritless dependents, with nothing of *Roman* but the name, crowded the towns and country-seats. The vices of the upper class rapidly thinned their ranks, till most of the old noble families became extinct. The barbarous lords then rushed in, finding scarcely any thing to obstruct their progress. The abject Roman multitude became slaves in form, as they had been for some time in spirit. The Goth and Vandal threw their chains on the descendants of Cincinnatus and Brutus, and sent them to work in their kitchens and farm-yards. The children of the men from whom Scipio sprung became the scavengers and scullions of Visigoths and Huns. The way had been prepared by the destruction of the middle class, — a class which contains the bone and muscle of any community in which it exists. A foundation was thus laid for the slavery of the Middle Ages.

3. In the darkness and confusion which reigned from the fourth to the twelfth century, we might expect that such an institution as slavery would flourish. It was in a sense suited to the times. Its undistinguished and forgotten lot was in some cases, no doubt, a real blessing to individuals, though on general principles, and as a system, it is worthy of nothing but execration. Partial benefits accompanied the feudal system, though in its essential features no wise man could commend it.

4. In the abolition of the servitude of the Middle Ages, Christianity again performed her work of mercy. When-

ever her voice could be heard, the poor *villein* was not forgotten. All contemporary and subsequent history conspires to attribute the gradual abolition of the system to her beneficent but effectual aid.

5. The Northern nations of Europe seem always to have possessed a sense of individual freedom, of personal rights, which, when enlightened and directed by Christianity, became a powerful antagonist force to slavery. The spirit which broke out at Runnymede, at London in 1688, at Philadelphia in 1776, was nurtured in its infancy in the woods of Sweden, and in the marshes of Denmark.

6. The contemporaneous revival of learning must come in for its share in the abolition of slavery. Xenophon and Cicero and Lucan could not be perused without exerting a beneficial influence in ameliorating the asperity of manners, in inspiring a love for freedom, and a tender sympathy towards the oppressed.

7. The same effect must be attributed to the establishment of large towns and cities. This circumstance increased the demand for labor. Various classes of artisans sprung into existence. Wherever ingenuity and skill were required, free labor was in demand. Slavery vanished before the spirit of competition. Labor became honorable. The value of land was augmented. A free population followed in the train.

Note. — The original authorities which we have consulted on this subject are the Glossarium of Ducange, on the words *Servus*, *Villanus*, *Tributales*, *Originarii*, *Forismaritagium*, *Arimanni*, *Oblati*, *Manumissio*, etc., in 6 vols. folio; Heineccius, in 8 vols. quarto; Muratori's Antiquities of Italy, in 6 vols. folio; works of De Malby, in French, 12 vols. octavo. These works are in the Boston Athenæum, and are an invaluable

storehouse of materials. Dr. Robertson has two very valuable notes on the subject in the first volume of his History of Charles V. See also Hallam's Middle Ages; Brodie's British Empire; the first volume of Lingard's History of England; Turner's Anglo-Saxons; Dunham's Germanic Empire; Sismondi's Italian Republics; Montesquieu; Blackstone's Commentaries; Grotius de Jure Belli et Pacis, etc.

CLASSICAL STUDIES.*

In the United States, the question of classical education has often been discussed, and its utility sometimes vehemently denied. In the mean time, the study of the Greek and Roman authors, and the taste for ancient art, have been making constant progress, both in schools and colleges. Many of the choicest works of the classical writers have been carefully and learnedly edited by American scholars. Professor Woolsey's selection of the Attic Tragedies has been welcomed with applause, both at home and abroad; and his recent edition of the Gorgias of Plato is the best edition of that admirable dialogue, for practical use, that has ever yet appeared. Other works, prepared on similar principles, have been published from time to time; and, at present, the classical course, in several of our colleges, instead of being limited to a volume or two of extracts, embraces a series of entire works in all the leading departments

* This Essay was published in 1849, as an Introduction to the volume entitled "Classical Studies," edited by Professors Sears, Felton, and Edwards.

of ancient literature. The mode of studying antiquity has also been materially changed and improved within a few years. History, the arts, the domestic life, the private and public usages, the mythology, and the education of the ancients, have been carefully investigated, and their scattered lights concentrated upon the literary remains of antiquity. Thus classical scholarship in America is beginning to breathe the same spirit which animates it in the Old World; it is beginning to be something higher and better than the dry study of words and grammatical forms; it is becoming a liberal and elegant pursuit, — a comprehensive appreciation of the greatest works in history, poetry, and the arts, that the genius of man has ever produced.

Amidst the din of practical interests, the rivalries of commerce, and the general enterprises of the age, classical studies are gaining ground in public estimation. It must always be so with the advance of civilization. We must, however, confess with shame, that in American legislative assemblies, where we naturally look to find the highest courtesy of manners and the graces of literature, little proof of advancing culture, of any kind, is given. Scenes of brutality, to the disgrace and sorrow of the nation, are often enacted in the Congress of the United States, that seem to show that the night of barbarism is settling over the land. Many of the speeches delivered there exhibit a coarseness and vulgarity of sentiment, a disregard or ignorance of the proprieties of speech, an utter insensibility to the elegances of letters, and to the humanizing influences of the arts, which must be bitterly deplored. When a work of art was lately received in Washington, — a work on which the great American sculptor had lavished all the resources of his genius, and spent several years in the flower of his life, —

it was assailed by an honorable member, in a strain of ribaldry which a gentleman cannot even quote.

But the prospects of American education and refinement are more encouraging, if we turn from public to private life. It is a much more common thing for young men to continue their classical studies beyond the time of the college education, than it has been in former days. The orators and dramatists of Greece and Rome are frequently made the companions of the writers on law and divinity, though classical pursuits are sometimes represented as on the decline all over the world. Modern literature, throbbing with present life, — impassioned poetry, which the strong and exciting character of the age kindles into fiery expression, — take hold of all hearts, stir up all minds, and leave but little time for the severer pursuits of the classical scholar. But this is a wrong view of the subject, at least in the extent to which it is sometimes carried. The excitements of modern literature lend additional ardor to classical studies. The young blood of modern literature has put new life into the literature of the dead languages. That exquisitely beautiful poem, Goethe's Iphigenia at Tauris, has inseparably connected the name of the great German with him whom Aristotle calls the most tragic of poets, and who was Milton's most cherished bard. The comparison between the German and the Greek gives a fresh charm to the works of both. This point is admirably illustrated in Hermann's eloquent preface to his edition of the Iphigenia Taurica of Euripides. That most delicate and harmonious tragic drama, the Ion of Mr. Talfourd, — whose composition shed a delight and a charm over many years of intense professional labor, — has led many a scholar back to the beautiful antique, from which the title and the general subject were taken; and the ap-

plause with which this masterly reproduction of the classical spirit and almost the antique form was welcomed, a few years ago, was a pleasant indication of the still existing love of antique beauty. The majestic simplicity of Milton's Samson Agonistes, and its Dorian choruses, forcibly bring to mind the Prometheus of Æschylus, and suggest very instructive comparisons between the lofty characters of the two poets. And who does not feel that he can better understand, and more profoundly appreciate, the glorious, but terrible imagination of the poet of Agamemnon, when he has once been moved and agitated by the awful power of Macbeth; when the myriad-minded poet of England, in whom the genius of man took its sublimest flights, has once entered into and taken possession of his soul.

But the Greek and Roman classics stand at the beginning and at the source of European culture. Nothing can displace them. Homer is the fountain-head of all European poetry and art. There he stands, venerable with nearly thirty centuries, touching his heroic harp to strains of unsurpassed, nay, unapproachable excellence and grandeur. All the features of a great heroic age, — the chivalry of the classical world, — from which European civilization dates, and political and domestic order take their rise, — stand forth in living reality, in his immortal pictures. There he stands, radiant with the beams of the early Grecian morning, as "jocund day stands tiptoe on the misty mountain-top." Who is to drive him from his station there? And how, then, is Homer to pass from the memory and the hearts of men? Impossible. It is not a question to be decided by a few petty and short-sighted utilitarian views. Homer's reign is firmly established over the literary world, and if any nation should ever become so barbarous as to

banish him from their schools, the penalty and disgrace would be their own. The language of Homer, as a picturesque, melodious, and enchanting instrument of thought, has never been surpassed.

Now these great ancients have been, time out of mind, the teachers of the civilized world. They form a common bond, which unites the cultivated minds of all nations and ages together. He who cuts himself off from the classics, excludes himself from a world of delightful associations with the best minds. He fails to become a member of the great society of scholars; he is an alien from the great community of letters. He may be a learned man; he may have all the treasures of science at his command; he may speak the modern languages with facility; but if he have not imbued his mind with at least a tincture of classical taste, he will inevitably feel that a great defect exists in his intellectual culture.*

We have said, that the neglect of classical studies among liberally educated men is less general now than formerly. And yet these pursuits are too often thrown aside. Why should they be so? Why is classical study abandoned at all, at the close of the college course? Are there good reasons for laying it aside when one leaves the walls of the university? The apology is substantially this. It has no immediate connection with practical life. Imperative duty is not to be neglected for an elegant pastime. The lawyer and the physician must direct their energies to the business on which their living depends. The client does not inquire, whether an advocate is conversant with Greek metres, or

---

* The preceding paragraphs of this Essay were written by Professor Felton, of Harvard College; the remainder by Professor Edwards.

can write beautiful Latin. A religious society seek for a good theologian and pastor. They care little for the classical phrase of his discourses. In other words, the members of the learned professions must not diverge to the right hand or to the left. Even if classical learning should be, in some respects, connected with the practical business of life, it is not so regarded by the mass of the people. The lawyer who is known to possess a fine classical taste, is less popular, other things being equal, than his neighbor who is a lawyer and nothing else. If he would be much sought after by clients, he must not read Homer, unless by stealth.

This method of reasoning, however, does not seem to accord with facts. Some of the most successful men in all the professions have been accomplished classical scholars, pursuing the study of the ancient languages in the midst of exhausting labors. A few instances may be cited. Edmund Burke said, that Virgil was a book which he always had within his reach. William Pitt was deeply versed in the niceties of construction and peculiarities of idiom, both in the Greek and Latin languages. It is mentioned of Curran, that, amid the distractions of business and ambition, he was all his life returning with fresh delight to the perusal of the classics. In the last journey which he ever took, Horace and Virgil were his travelling companions. The late Chief Justice Parsons, of Massachusetts, filling, perhaps, the most laborious office in the State, always found time to gratify his classical taste. John Luzac, an eminent professor of Greek at Leyden, spoke of him as "a giant in Greek criticism." Robert Hall, in the most active period of his ministry, devoted several hours in a day, for a number of years, to a thorough study of the classics. He often referred to Plato in terms of fervid eulogy, expressing his astonish-

ment at the neglect into which he apprehended the writings of that philosopher were sinking. In our own neighborhood, an eminent lawyer, constantly employed in the duties of his profession, stands confessedly at the head of American philologists. A judge, also, in one of our metropolitan courts, whose practical duties are of a very laborious nature, is a profound and accurate Greek scholar.

Reliance, however, in a question of this kind, need not be placed exclusively on special cases. It may be supported by satisfactory arguments, at least in relation to the clerical profession. A book written in Hebrew and Greek is their Magna Charta, their authoritative commission. Resort to translations is as obviously improper, as it would be for a constitutional lawyer to gain his knowledge of the political institutions of the State at second hand. A mastery of the original languages of the Bible was, probably, never attained by any one, who was not familiar with classical Greek. The main element of the New Testament is the later Attic dialect, as modified by the intermingling of words from other languages. Even authors of the highest name, in regard to style, like Xenophon and Pindar, throw much valuable light on the Scriptures. Homer and Herodotus remind the reader, in a thousand places, of the sweet simplicity and childlike artlessness which delight us in the narratives of the Pentateuch. Philo and Josephus are among the best helps for the interpretation of parts of the Bible. A large portion of the standard commentaries on the Scriptures, from the time of Jerome down, have been written in Latin.

The direct benefits of classical study to the medical and legal student may not be so obvious. The arguments which the lawyer employs, and the observations which direct the

physician's practice, are more or less of recent origin. Still, medical science first struck its roots into Grecian soil. The fathers of the healing art wrote in the Greek language. The distinguished physician, Boerhaave, who was well acquainted with Latin and Greek before he was eleven years old, was forcibly struck, in the course of his subsequent reading, with the correct method and sterling sense of Hippocrates. An eminent American physician has said, that the best descriptions of the symptoms of disease are found in the Greek language. Roman law is the parent and germ of every code which has been formed since. No sovereign, not even Napoleon himself, has done so much for the science of law, as the Greek Emperor Justinian. No language contains so many of the sources of scientific legislation as the Latin. It is a treasury of facts and principles down to our day.

It may be urged, indeed, that there is no necessity for repairing to the original fountain. All that is valuable in the treatises of Hippocrates, or in the rescripts of Justinian, are readily accessible in the modern languages. Why compel the student to ascend to the little spring hidden under the moss of an old language, when he can drink of a river that flows fast by his own door, and which has been increased by a thousand fresh fountains? A sufficient answer is, that we cannot understand a subject with certainty, if we do not trace it to its source. By the radical study of any topic, we come to feel an assurance of belief, which is one of the best elements of success, because it imparts to the mind a firm confidence in its own powers. It is said, that there are, in the writings of Hippocrates, some of the finest descriptions of the natural course of disease, disturbed neither by medicine nor violent interference. Now these

characteristic touches, which are the marks of genius, as well as of an accurate understanding, cannot be enjoyed through a translation. The more picturesque they are, the more need of seeing the very shape and coloring by which they are delineated. So of law and political science. Who has laid the best foundation for statesmanship, — the man that has patiently studied Demosthenes, Thucydides, and Polybius, in the original; or he whose knowledge of ancient Greece is made up from Langhorne's Plutarch, and Mitford's jaundiced History? Mere information is not the only thing which is needed. There are now American senators, whose heads are crammed with encyclopædias, but whose great, ponderous speeches have no other effect than to thin the senate-chamber. A statesman needs that close, vivid apprehension of a principle or theory, which he can get from Thucydides, but not from Rollin. In the sciences of law and medicine, much is depending on nice discrimination in language, or exact definition. Who is so well prepared to make accurate distinctions as he who is versed in the literature of those languages, where the greater number of medical and political terms have their origin?

Still more important are the indirect benefits of classical study. Among these are its effects in securing completeness of character, both intellectual and moral. The powers of the soul are various in their structure, and are developed only by various nourishment. Being a bright image of the perfect Mind that formed it, the soul has susceptibilities for all things beautiful and sublime in nature and in art. The law graven on it is violated whenever its affections are hemmed in upon one dusty track. A man may be so absorbed with the cure of the maladies of the body, or of legislation, that a single faculty of his mind attains an enor-

mous growth, while he has no ear for the music which comes from every part of the visible creation, or those finer strains uttered by every well-attuned human soul.

An illustration of this tendency may be drawn from the clerical profession. A clergyman may limit his studies to Oriental literature. He may be inordinately fond of the literary treasures of the East. The poetry of the Hebrews is, undoubtedly, loftier than that of any other people. "The sweet singer of Israel" is the child of nature. He opens his imaginative soul to the full impression of the scenes around him. He is fettered by no passion for ideal beauty, by none of the devices of rhyme, metre, or fastidious criticism. His song breaks out in the stately rhythm of nature. All things tend towards the sublime. He looks off from Lebanon, and sees the sun setting on the level bosom of the "great sea and wide on every hand," without an intervening object. The same luminary, rising on a boundless desert of sand, is one of the grandest objects in nature. The tempest has a terrible commission to execute there. In his ideas of the true God, also, the Hebrew has, immeasurably, the superiority over the Greek and the Roman. By universal consent, the passages which are sublimest in Greek poetry, are those which make the nearest approach to the Hebrew delineations of the Divine attributes.

Yet, on the other hand, in the quality of beauty the Greek has greatly the advantage. His language is an exact copy of himself, easy, graceful, flexible, fashioned to express the subtlest conceptions, and to charm the most practised ear; cultivated till, as it should seem, cultivation could proceed no further; copious in its forms, perfect music in its movement. The scenery, too, of Greece, and the natural treasures which it contained, conspired to the same end. "Five

hours' walk from the plain of Marathon," says Dr. Wordsworth, "are the marble quarries of Pentelicus, inviting, by its perfect whiteness and splendor, the chisel of Phidias and Praxiteles. On another side of Athens, are the quarries of the snow-white Megarian, and the gray stone of Eleusis, to which Rome was indebted for some of her best buildings." All things tended to make the Greeks a nation of artists. They had the richest materials in overflowing abundance, the kindest sky for the preservation of their works, and an exquisite inward sense for fair proportion and beautiful forms.

Now, have not such things an influence in training the mind of the theological scholar? If he fails to cultivate his original susceptibilities for sweet sounds and delicate thoughts, or, in other words, if he does not repair to the primary sources and true models for instruction, so far will his soul continue unformed and unsightly. If he cannot refresh his weary spirit, or unfold some of his better faculties by classical culture, he should accept it as a severe misfortune.

Is the study of the modern tongues an equivalent? The French language has immense stores of science; the German, of literature. Paris is the centre of medical knowledge; Berlin and Heidelberg, of legal. Still, it may be doubted whether the best works in any modern language are fitted, in the highest degree, to educate the soul. How different is the impression which is felt in the perusal of what are called the classical works in French and German, from that which is experienced while reading the Tusculan Questions, or the Phædo! The difference, indeed, is partly owing to association. The latter have the ancient coloring upon them. There are a thousand time-hallowed reminis-

cences connected with old Hesiod and Homer. The modern languages remind us of copyrights, and of the steam power-press. Yet it is not to be wholly ascribed to the mellowing effect of time. No languages ever were, none ever will be, polished like the Greek and Latin. There is no similar instance in the ancient world. No such phenomenon will exist hereafter, because all the modern languages are necessarily undergoing rapid changes. The art of printing is as fatal to the perfection of the outward form in English or in German, as it is to the faultless calligraphy of the Persian scribe. Innumerable causes are at work to modify the German, a language which has some close affinities to the Greek. Should it cease to be, in some of the strange accidents of time, a spoken language, stopped in its mid-career, like a stream from the Alps suddenly congealed by the frost, what motley forms would it reveal! How different from the two classical languages! About these there is a repose, a sculpture-like finish, a serenity, to which no modern dialect approaches. What a perfect correspondence between the thought and the expression! The writer does not stumble on a synonyme or a word somewhere in the neighborhood of that which was needed, like most modern authors, but hits the very word. We feel that it would be sacrilege to try to change it for another. In the best Greek writers, the collocation of words is wonderfully felicitous, not resulting from the laws of prosody alone, but from the musical soul of the writer. The Italian is called a beautiful language, but how unlike is its monotony to the endless variety of the Homeric hexameter, or the lofty rhythm of the Platonic prose.

It is sometimes asked, in a sceptical tone, Why this idolatrous attachment to the classics? Why do Latin and

Greek hold such supremacy over the thousand tongues of earth? It is enough to answer, that the fact is beyond contradiction. We do not know why the Egyptian language was not more perfect. Yet we hardly feel bound to sit down and study Coptic for the purpose of improving our taste. It is not known why there have not been more than one Shakspeare and one Milton. But, because our attachment to these masters may be called idolatrous, ought we to betake ourselves to Sir Richard Blackmore's Creation and Glover's Leonidas? Just so with Greek and Latin. They happen to be the only languages which are developed according to the rules of perfect art. Therefore it is the wisdom of all public men, who would mature their own faculties, and labor worthily in their respective spheres, to devote a little time every day to these ancient masters of wisdom and eloquence.

The members of the learned professions are necessarily involved in wearying cares. In the whirl of business, or in the collisions of interest, the feelings of the heart are apt to be blunted, and, though once delicate and gentle, to become harsh and violent. Something is needed to soothe the chafed spirit. What better resort than to Cicero's Epistles, or Homer's Odyssey, in order to calm the troubled heart, and recall the pleasant days of early youth. The very sight of an ancient classic sometimes acts as a spell to lay the irritated temper. It speaks with the voice of an affectionate monitor, full of the words of wisdom.

In the strifes of various kinds, which all men in public life must encounter, more or less, it is well that there is a common ground on which they can mingle in friendly intercourse. There is an ancient classical homestead, which has not been divided off among the different heirs. All will

be received back with a joyous welcome. All have the same right to the fruits and flowers. No theories of government, no theological feuds, no small bickerings, may find admission among this happy gathering. There is a binding influence even in Greek and Latin words. In the very midst of a stormy debate, a felicitous classical allusion will sometimes restore good humor. On the floor of the British Parliament, a well-timed citation from Horace has often been like oil poured upon the troubled waters. It recalls to Whig and Tory the happy days of Eton and of Westminster, or the ripening scholarship and joyous communion of later college days. In a neighboring State, there is a veteran statesman and scholar, who was fourteen years a Senator of the United States, "whose selectest pleasure it has been, for sixty years, to commune with those immortal minds, who have bequeathed to the world the richest treasures of thought, and the most exquisite models of style." Who can tell the worth of this venerable Nestor, in maintaining the decorum of a deliberative body? The scenes of wild turmoil that have so often reigned in the lower branch, to the shame of the actors and the sorrow of the country, were not caused, it may be confidently affirmed, by the classical scholars in that house. Those who daily commune with the best minds of antiquity may, and sometimes do, differ in political opinion, but they have no taste for the coarse dialect of the low-bred politician. The vernacular language is the armory to which the demagogue resorts. A thorough classical training, and a continued recurrence, through life, to these sources of refined feeling and elegant thought, give one of the best assurances for a kind and gentlemanly deportment in public men.

A happy influence is exerted by classical study in another

way. It is well known, that our mental and moral habits are intimately connected with our style of thinking and of speaking. Thus our sense of rectitude is very much dependent on the accuracy of the language which we employ. Confusion in speech leads to confusion in morals. Perspicuity in diction is often the parent of clear mental and moral conceptions. Hence, scarcely any thing is more important in the culture of the young, than exact attention to the nicer shades of thought; than the ability to discriminate in respect to all terms, (those relating to moral subjects particularly,) which are, in general, regarded as synonymous. One of the chief benefits of classical study goes to this very point. It is itself a process of accurate comparison. It is taking the valuation, as it were, of the whole stock of two most copious languages. Some of the principal authors use words with wonderful precision. Plato, for instance, defines with microscopic acuteness. His power of analysis was, perhaps, never equalled. His ear seemed to be so trained as to detect the slightest differences both in the sense and in the sound of words. This is one reason why no translation can do justice either to his poetic cadences or to his thoughts. No one can be familiar with such an author, and really perceive the fitness of his words, and the truth of the distinctions which they imply, without becoming himself a more exact reasoner and a nicer judge of moral truth. Language, when thus employed, is not a dead thing. It reacts, with quickening power, on our minds and hearts. When we use words of definite import, our intellectual and moral judgments will become definite. A hazy dialect is the parent of a hazy style of thinking, if it is not of doubtful actions. The dishonest man, and the dishonest state, often allow themselves to be imposed upon by a loose mode of

reasoning, and a looser use of language. Here, then, may be drawn an argument, not unimportant, in favor of continued attention to those finished models of style and of thought, which are found in the studies in question. They nourish a delicacy of perception, and the sentiments and feelings gradually gain that crystal clearness which belongs to the visible symbols.

Once more, it is to be feared that a degenerating process has been long going on in our vernacular tongue. There is danger that it will become the dialect of conceits, of prettinesses, of dashing coxcombry, or of affected strength, and of extravagant metaphor. Preachers, as well as writers, appear to regard convulsive force as the only quality of a good style. They seem to imagine that the human heart is, in all its modes, to be carried by storm. Their aim is the production of immediate practical effect. Hence there is a struggle for the boldest figures and the most passionate oratory. The same tendency is seen in the hall of legislation, and preëminently in much of our popular literature. Passion, over-statement, ridiculous conceits, the introduction of terms that have no citizenship in any language on earth, a disregard of grammar, an affected smartness, — characterize, to a very melancholy degree, our recent literature. To be natural, is to be antiquated. To use correct and elegant English, is to plod. Hesitancy in respect to the adoption of some new-fangled word, is the sure sign of a purist. Such writers as Addison and Swift are not to be mentioned in the ears of our "enterprising" age. The man, or the woman, who should be caught reading the Spectator, would be looked upon as smitten with lunacy. In short, there is reason to fear that our noble old tongue is changing into a dialect for traffickers, magazine-writers, and bedlamites.

One way, by which this acknowledged evil may be stayed, is a return to such books as Milton, Dryden, and Cowper loved; to such as breathed their spirit into the best literature of England; to the old historians and poets, that were pondered over, from youth to hoary years, by her noblest divines, philosophers, and statesmen. Eloquence, both secular and sacred, such as the English world has never listened to elsewhere, has flowed from minds that were imbued with classical learning.

FEMALE EDUCATION.*

On the 25th of November, 1838, a young lady died at Ballston, in the State of New York, in the sixteenth year of her age. She seemed hardly to be a creature of earth, but to have wandered hither by accident from some more blessed region than ours. There were about her a grace, a strange purity, a sunny brightness, which were not so much genius, as mind in its *freed* state. We have never heard or read of one of human mould, who was more perfectly divested of the grossness which appertains to our condition here. Yet she possessed all the innocent feelings of humanity. Never did one pass a blither childhood. She had not a particle of that acid melancholy which is sometimes allied to genius.

The first sentence which breaks from the lips of the unreflecting reader, on rising from the contemplation of her brief career, is, that such a gift is not to be coveted. We should shrink from having aught to do with one so ethereal. We look with fear and trembling on a flower which shows its delicate petal in February. Give us the hardy plant that

* An Address at the Fourth Anniversary of the Mount Holyoke Female Seminary, South Hadley, Mass., July 29th, 1841.

can endure the early frost and later heat. Intrust us with the intellect which has some alliance with earth, some fitness to its stern necessities.

Others, on perusing this volume, will give us a homily on the imprudence of parents and teachers. Her premature death, they say, is a warning which should not be neglected. It shows the imminent hazard of stimulating the susceptible faculties to an intemperate and fatal growth.

> "But we are glad she has lived *thus* long,
> And glad that she has gone to her reward."

Her course was ordered in perfect wisdom. May she not have done that which the longest career of usefulness, as it is commonly termed, fails to do? May she not have had a sublimer errand than others have? May not her brief sojourn here throw some light on the mystery of our nature? We gain a vivid idea of a human soul. The thick veil is for a moment lifted up. She had the light and airy movement of a winged spirit. We seem to be gazing on the delicate structure of a seraph; and yet she had the yearning sympathies of a child of earth.

If such is the nature of mind, would be our reflection, it is worth while to educate it. If it be capable, through the goodness of Providence and the grace of the Redeemer, of being clothed upon with such attractiveness, then the selectest human agency should be employed in aiding its development, and fitting it for its destiny. Education cannot, indeed, create talent or genius; but it can teach one to sympathize with genius. It can elevate the mind into communion with those to whom God has imparted his rarest gifts. It can raise all the faculties into that condition of healthful excitement or serene repose, which will enable it to appreciate,

if it cannot reproduce, the products of more richly endowed natures.

It is a frequent complaint in our books on mental philosophy, that we cannot examine the mind in its unperverted state. It is the mind of the adult which we analyze; filled, it may be, with prejudices, hardened by intercourse with the world, and revealing but little of its primeval guilelessness. The intellectual history of a child is needed in its unsophisticated state. In the instance of Miss Davidson, and of her doubly sister spirit, we have that which the philosopher needs, — the inward life of two children, a sparkling freshness in their actions, a winning childlikeness in every gesture. They unconsciously unfold those processes of thought and imagination, which are traced but faintly, or which are a momentary gleam, in the minds of other children.

We err much in setting all these things to the account of genius, or as mysterious emanations from the sovereign Intellect, which it were as vain to study, as it were to try to grasp the colors of the rainbow. We *are* deeply concerned with them. They ennoble our common nature. They are links which ally us to the pure spirits above. They prove that the human mind is a gem, whose value no rhetoric can tell. They are an ample justification for what we behold to-day. The mere contemplation of them imparts dignity to the meanest adjunct in this work of education. We, who are teachers, are tempted to lose sight of our high calling, to merge the sublime end in the unhonored means. It is a weary round which we are called to tread. We need stimulus more than information, stirring motive, rather than the accumulation of argument. Every thing which shows vividly the nature of mind, which stamps a priceless value

on its cultivation, all those secret impulses which one feels, but cannot describe, as he is reading the pages of history or biography; — all these and similar things are of inestimable worth, as encouragements, as confirming the motives to effort, and as throwing an unaccustomed freshness on what might seem, otherwise, to be servile and unremunerated toil.

Nowhere is such encouragement needed more than in female schools. Nowhere are there so many formidable obstacles to be overcome. In the education of the other sex, the case does not admit of argument. Unless the young man has a disciplined mind, there is no possibility of his success. He *must* be a hard student, or he will never attain his object. There is no alternative between close application and a wretched failure. Self-interest comes in with a louder voice than filial affection. The path before him is crowded with competitors who will never remit one step. Thus the call of ambition becomes more imperative than any abstract love of knowledge, any lofty ideal of excellence, any living impersonation of talent or genius.

But with the female sex it is not thus. To the agitations of political strife they are of course strangers. The unrelaxing hold of self-interest they have never felt. Of the power of a stern necessity, compelling them to pursue an ample course of study, they know nothing. These privileges or disadvantages, as the case may be, are almost exclusively confined to men.

It may be said, however, that this infelicity in respect to motives is more than compensated by the greater purity of those which do operate. The desire for usefulness may be as powerful as all other influences united, and this coincides perfectly with the precepts of Revelation, and the demands

of conscience. But, unhappily, this consideration has been robbed of much of its efficacy. It has been strenuously argued, that the usefulness of females is not promoted by a protracted mental discipline; that the line of their duty lies in another direction; that too much learning will not make them mad, but it will make them useless; that their appropriate sphere is not in the range of books and contemplation, but of active benevolence, and retired, unceasing physical labor. The power of the motive has thus been broken. Suspicion has been cast upon vigorous intellectual exertions. A literary woman has been made the butt of ridicule, as though learning and a conscientious attention to practical duties were incompatible.

It has long been a favorite topic for discussion with young men, whether the intellectual powers of the two sexes are equal. This is among the first and weightiest questions which the village lyceum argues. It is regularly propounded in the academy. Its merits are diligently canvassed by every Freshman class in college, unless, indeed, the youthful collegian has recently become wiser than his predecessors.

But all these greedy disputants seem to have forgotten, that there is little *fairness* in the question. We know nothing of mind, but from its developments. We cannot judge of the original abstract strength of intellect. Its *manifestations* are the only means by which we can form a judgment; and these will be made only as there is opportunity. Mind will be dormant unless there is motive to awaken it. But in respect to females, motives have never yet existed, to any considerable extent. Long-continued attention to literary and scientific pursuits has been discouraged. What they have done has been by stealth, by

accident, at short intervals. Those who acquire distinction in the fields of knowledge are gazed upon as prodigies; and it is a wonder if men, in the height of their candor, do not attach some opprobrious epithet to them. But how is it possible that they should be other than prodigies? There is no expectation that the intellectual powers of the sex will be generally and highly cultivated. Public opinion has not demanded it. It has rather frowned it down. Men, in great numbers, have become distinguished in every branch of knowledge. But this was owing, in no slight measure, to the fact that their learning could be appreciated and honored. False pretensions would be certainly exposed. A sympathizing community are ready to applaud and to employ their acquisitions. But with the other sex it has been widely different. No fostering public sentiment has encouraged them. Their delicacy has shrunk from that dishonored notoriety which is the result of eminence. Their original powers may be, or may not be, equal to those of men. We have little disposition to pronounce on this question. But there has been as yet no fair opportunity to decide it. High mental cultivation has been insulated and rare. Men are stimulated to effort by a thousand influences to which women are strangers. One generation act on another. A flood of intellectual light has been poured on their path from the remotest ages. They could hardly help being enlightened, whether they would or not. But with females it has rather been darkness visible. Their course you can trace back, as that of a river, when the morning fog is on its banks, while the sunlight is bathing the adjacent hills. What a stimulus do men feel in looking away on those illuminated points for four thousand years? What untold influences does not this exert, at the

present moment, in their intellectual discipline? But how totally the reverse is it with females? *Their* motives must arise from an opposite quarter, — from a desire to rescue their sex from the thraldom of centuries, and to create those things which shall serve as happy reminiscences, and controlling motives, rather than passively to rely on the glorious recollections of the past.

Let us see if it is not thus. Let us look for a moment into the page of history. And here, at the beginning, we would exclude the whole uncivilized and Muhammedan world. Much, indeed, is said of the degradation of females in those regions. But we should prefer their condition to that of their masters. The lot of the sufferer is to be envied, more than that of the taskmaster. It is better to be the unresisting victim of violence, than to brandish the rod of a despot, or revel in the gains of the outlaw. The poor, trembling drudge, who waits upon the desires of the haughty sheikh of the desert, or she who plants the cornfield in one of our primeval forests, may have as much mind as the owner of a dozen starved camels has; or as he who slumbers half his days in his wigwam, and is the comrade of the trout or the wild buffalo the other half. Both sexes are at the lowest point of degradation. The simple difference is, that one are the greatest sinners, the other the greatest sufferers.

The Israelites are the only ancient nation where we can find much which relieves the dark picture. There was a delicacy and a greatness of soul among some of the females, which was not to be found in any other Asiatic nation, and which were the result of their religious institutions. "Honor thy *mother*," was the authoritative command, which contributed, perhaps, more than any other one thing to dignify the

female sex, and to make a family among the Jews a different circle from what was seen under a Kurdish black tent, or in a South-African kraal. Still the education of the Jewish female was very limited. As the father was the sole instructor of the son, so the mother was the only teacher of her daughter. Music and dancing, with instruction in household affairs, was the beginning and end of the education of the countrywomen of Miriam and Deborah.

When we go over to Greece, — polished, beautiful, musical Greece, — there is hardly any thing which distinguishes the women from those of the hordes of Scythia or Sarmatia. The Dorians were the only tribe, who made any serious attempt to develop the understanding of females. But this was at the sacrifice of individual character. The Spartan women were trained for the state. They were educated to be the mothers and sisters of military heroes. Bravery, an Indian stoicism, the ability to endure suffering in its fiercest forms, was the end of their being even from the cradle. The inexorable lawgiver required that the female, as well as the male, should engage in bodily exercise; and for both he instituted trials of running and of strength. A martial character was imparted to the entire race. It is a remarkable fact, that in no kind of Greek poetry have we so many female authors as in the lyric, where the military spirit predominates; and these authors belonged to Sparta, or to the Doric race.*

The rest of the Greeks, says Xenophon, required females to sit solitary and spin wool. The great majority of them lived a secluded life, scarcely differing from the slaves by

* See Cramer, Geschichte der Erziehung, etc. Elberfeld, 1838. 2 vols. Vol. II. p. 444.

whom they were surrounded, both classes alike ignorant and superstitious. A few individuals, indeed, rose above this dead level of debasement. Socrates did something in this work of salutary reform. Plato proceeded still further, and gave females an active share in the business of the state, though not in its higher departments. Lasthenia and Axiothea are expressly mentioned as among the hearers of Plato. Their philosophical education was completed under Speusippus. But these instances were very rare, and they were more likely to be found among the slaves than the free-women. Some of them, too, like the friend of Pericles, suffered in morals, in proportion to their reputation for intellectual accomplishments. A striking fact in proof of the obscurity of Grecian women is the very small number whose names are mentioned in history. There are Penelope, Helen, Nausicaa, Aspasia, Sappho, and a few others, whose deeds or writings entitled them, in the view of the historian or the poet, to an honorable place. But the great mass, almost without exception, lived in deplorable ignorance ; and that too in Greece, under the climate of Paradise, in sight of the Parthenon, on the banks of the Ilissus, in the walks of the Academy. These were the countrywomen of Xenophon, Pericles, Plato, and Æschylus. The female form was sculptured in such lines of beauty and grace, as were never rivalled before or since. When some Helen or Venus was the subject, the artist dipped his pencil for eternity. Yet the living and breathing form was utterly neglected. The minds of thousands of freeborn women in Athens, made to live when the solid Parthenon shall have crumbled to dust, received less attention than a chiselled ape ; occasioned less solicitude than the picture of a swan, or the proportion of a cornice. What was Socrates doing ?

Why was not the divine Plato more sagacious? While he was writing his Republic, and speculating nobly on his pre-existent ideas, his countrywomen were perishing by thousands around the very groves where he was discoursing. Why did he not see that his native land could not continue to exist, while one half of its free population were in the iron bonds of ignorance? Why did not the practical Aristotle arouse his countrymen to this fatal deficiency? No system of politics or ethics would be of any avail in the absence of female education. The country *must* sink under the dominion of the Roman or the Scythian, if those who ought to have been its educators were themselves in the blackness of darkness.

We turn to the Romans with some more comfort. They made a decided advance towards a more perfect civilization, partly by attaching importance to the female sex. Among the Romans we find an increase of domestic felicity. The family becomes an important element in society. The Grecian women, like Briseis and Helen, were often the cause of quarrels and wars. The Roman matrons, on the other hand, frequently deserved the blessing of peacemakers. They prevented the horrors of civil strife, and saved Rome itself from pillage. We linger fondly over the memories of Lucretia and Cornelia,* not merely on account of their individual virtues, but because they were the representatives of a considerable class. From the turbulence of the forum, from the discordant sounds of the market-place, the senator could retire to a secluded and quiet home. Even in later periods, when Roman virtue had sadly degenerated,

* "Legimus epistolas Corneliæ, matris Gracchorum: apparet, filios non tam in gremio educatos, quam in sermone matris."— *Cicero, Brut.* 58.

we meet with a few touching instances of pure domestic happiness, as recorded in the pages of Quinctilian, Cicero, and Pliny. When death invaded these scenes of bliss, as he did some of them in circumstances uncommonly affecting, we cannot but ardently wish that the balm of Christian hope had been poured into the torn bosoms of the almost frantic survivors.

Still the Roman women were not *educated*. The domestic and other virtues to which we have alluded, were not the result of mental cultivation. This will account in part for their comparatively limited extent and early decay. They were not rooted and grounded in a good moral and intellectual training. There was nothing in them which could meet the storms that overwhelmed the Roman State. Among the mass of the matrons, there was no conservative influence either from Christianity or a sound education. Prejudices existed against high attainments in learning on the part of females, if we may credit the Roman satirists.*

In the intellectual condition of females in the Middle Ages, we find little which is encouraging. It is true, that at one period they were the arbiters of taste and fashion. Of the laws of honor they were the despotic judges. But this was an unnatural state of society. Many of the high-born dames, that were worshipped at tilts and tourneys, could not read.

---

* "Sit non doctissima conjux," Martial, II. 90, makes as a condition in marriage.

> "Non habeat matrona, tibi quæ juncta recumbit,
> Dicendi genus, aut curvum sermone rotato
> Torqueat enthymema, nec historas sciat omnes:
> Sed quædam ex libris et non intelligat."
>
> *Juv.* VI. 448.

See Gallus; Romische Scenen aus der Zeit Augustus. Von Becker, I. 53.

Their moral education was totally neglected, and the entire number of those who figured in the exploits of chivalry, were insignificant compared with the millions who were in the thickest gloom of error.

We are accustomed to look to the age of Queen Elizabeth, as hallowed by a bright constellation of female genius. It was so. Lady Jane Grey, Anne Bacon, the mother of the Chancellor, Mildred Burleigh, Margaret Beaufort, the proud Queen herself, and others, who, according to Wotton, seemed to think that Plato and Aristotle *untranslated* were fit companions to their closets, are names that shall never die. Amid bloody wars, diabolical assassinations, and the meanest court intrigues which deform the pages of English history, these furnish a grateful digression; they make one page of that history pure and fragrant. But they are like half a dozen stars in a cloudy night. Their countrywomen generally were as ignorant of letters as the animals which they rode to market. To them books were, both literary and metaphorically, chained. If they could read, they were not able to procure books. One favored countess, in the fifteenth century, gave, among other things, two hundred sheep, for a copy of a single volume of homilies. While Bacon was writing his Organon, while his mother and her sister were enraptured with the eloquence of the Phædo, drinking in those musical sentences which are almost quivering with life, the vast majority of their countrywomen were living in cabins without chimneys, as ignorant almost of the immaterial principle within them, as was the dog that crouched beneath their feet, or the rude spinning-wheel which their hands were turning.

In modern Europe we find important changes. In the gradual amelioration of society, females have necessarily

shared. If schools had been wholly confined to men, they would have partaken indirectly, but largely, of their benefits. The son and the brother cannot receive a liberal education, without shedding on the circle at home some rays of knowledge. The general intelligence which prevails, and the rapid communication of thought over all civilized countries, must exert some influence on every class in society. No portion could avoid receiving a few rays of light, if they would. To these negative influences, we must add some direct exertions which have been made for the education of women. In the comprehensive school-systems, which characterize three or four of the most enlightened countries of Christendom, they have not been passed by. In the blessings of the common school, particularly, they have bountifully partaken.

Still there are serious deficiencies. In no country of Europe has any adequate provision been made for their higher education. The means for their intellectual discipline are altogether inferior to those which the more favored sex enjoy. Public sentiment is not by any means awake to the importance of giving to females a thorough intellectual training.

We may take Germany as an example. The facilities for the education of men, in the schools, gymnasia, universities, and professional seminaries, are, as is well known, of the highest order. But there are no such provisions for the complete education of females. On the contrary, we are assured, that such education is not regarded as necessary. In the lighter branches of knowledge, in those studies which develop the imagination and refine the taste, not a few of the German women are, doubtless, accomplished. But any thing which deserves the name of *liberal* educa-

tion, they do not in general possess. Those studies which strengthen the practical faculties, which give maturity to the understanding, and which lay a firm basis for character, are greatly undervalued; even if means for pursuing them are furnished. The wretched prejudice against a learned lady, recognized by Martial, and which has given occasion for many poor witticisms, is not wholly banished, we fear, from the polite and learned circles of Berlin and Göttingen.

Of the history of female education in our own country, we have but little to say. Our emigrant forefathers were too poor to educate their daughters. Some of the more favored families in the large towns had recourse to the schools or domestic teachers of the old country. Some respectable private or family schools were subsequently established on the Atlantic coast, whither a few individuals from the inland towns had the privilege of resorting. The daughters of clergymen, by journeying one or two hundred miles on horseback, were enabled to avail themselves of these precious opportunities. But the women of New England, up to the close of the Revolutionary war, were indebted, as a general thing, to the district school merely, for their scanty education. Their attendance, in multitudes of cases, was limited to three or four months of the year; while these poor advantages could be enjoyed only in common with fifty or a hundred other persons, and after a laborious walk of three or four miles, often through rain or snow. A delineation of these disabilities, we have heard from the lips of many persons of the last generation. Improvements, which might have been gradually introduced, were suspended, or prevented, by the French and the Revolutionary wars. The busy household were manufacturing blankets for their

brothers at Louisburg and Crown Point, or making bread for the camp at Cambridge or Saratoga.

Since the Revolution, and especially during the present century, considerable advance has been made. The academies in some of the larger towns have been of inestimable service to those families that had the means of defraying the expense. In many cases, the winter, central school in a town has been taught by some one who was master of the higher branches of education. The names of a few individuals ought ever to be held in grateful remembrance, for exciting a new interest in favor of female education. Some of the schools, which they founded, exist to the present time. Others, which have been discontinued, doubtless prepared the way for more permanent undertakings.

While, therefore, we accord to our fathers, and to the estimable teachers of our own day, to whom we have just referred, all due praise, we cannot be blind to the mournful deficiencies which continued to exist, and which now, in a great measure, remain.

It has been always observed, that the small girls in a primary school, as a general thing, have more active minds than the other sex ; are in advance of their male associates in the same class. In a few years, however, the order is reversed. At the age of sixteen or eighteen years, the lads have gained upon the other portion of the school in almost every thing which constitutes a solid education. This change has been accounted for in various ways. One of the causes may be the want of thorough habits in many of the teachers of young ladies. The lad is *drilled*. His tasks are urged upon him without fear or favor. No allowance is made for delicate nerves, shrinking modesty, or any like thing. He is compelled to master his lessons. But in the recitations

of girls above a certain age, there is a species of *politeness*, on the part of the teacher, which is carried to excess. The modesty of the pupil is too much consulted. Her mind is not invigorated by that somewhat rough treatment with which her brother may be visited.

Another reason is the inequality in the literary advantages of the two sexes. After a certain period, there is a wide divergency. The intellectual privileges of young ladies have borne no suitable proportion to those enjoyed by the youth in our colleges and professional schools. If they have had facilities for instruction, it has been only at intervals; and then one third of the time has been consumed in recovering the ground which had been lost. The entire circle of arts and sciences is, perhaps, traversed; but it has been, too often, with little practical effect. One great end of education is the formation of a well-balanced intellectual character; but to render this possible, two things are necessary, — thorough study, and attention to a sufficient number of branches to meet the peculiar wants of each power of the mind. But such a result cannot be expected from the recitations of six or twelve months, scattered through several years. The harvest will be in proportion to the labor bestowed in preparing the ground.

It is on these accounts that we rejoice in the establishment of seminaries like the one whose anniversary we celebrate to-day. It is meeting, as it has long seemed to us, one great want of the times. It is concentrating influences which had been previously scattered, and but of little avail. We do not now speak of the details of the plan which has been adopted here. There may be imperfections in these. What we mean is, that the undertaking, as a whole, appears to us to be based on a true and enduring foundation, and to

promise *that* for the intellectual and moral discipline of the young women of our country, which has long been the great desideratum.

In illustrating this position, we remark :

I. That such seminaries attach the idea of *permanence* to the education of females.

Hitherto schools for young women have been connected with buildings fitted to produce no one definite impression, unless it be, that they are equally adapted to a hundred different purposes. On entering them, the pupil feels nothing of the genius of the place. There are no affecting reminiscences, no venerable associations. The edifice was ten years ago a tavern, it may be ten years hence a cotton-manufactory.

There are those who object to the erection of halls of study for the use of colleges. They would disperse the undergraduates among the houses of the neighboring village. They would advocate the plan which has been generally adopted in Germany, where the university has no " local habitation."

But, as it seems to us, they overlook a point of great importance. A college without a building is a flitting ghost without a body. The building embodies and enshrines the wandering idea. It gives form and an earthly immortality to a thousand associations otherwise evanescent. Were we going to study in Germany, we should prefer, other things being equal, the University of Bonn, partly because it is situated among the vine-clad hills of the Rhine, but mainly because its site is an old palace, with its gray and venerable towers and gateways.

An edifice, in such circumstances, is not a mass of stone, or of brick and mortar. Its cold face is instinct with life.

It becomes a living teacher, giving lessons profounder in their impression, sublimer in their unity, than the most accomplished professor could dictate. The pyramid, which lifts its firm head among the shifting sands of the desert, is an instructor more impressive than all the Egyptian magi from the first Pharaoh downwards. It is the fixedness of eternity amid the accidents of time. The layers of granite, which are now weekly lifted up on Bunker Hill, will convey one great lesson, till some earthquake topples them over.

The United States Bank at Philadelphia, in its severe simplicity, it has been said, is the best teacher of rhetoric, if it is not of financiering, which is to be found in our country. No one can gaze on the gateway of the Girard College in the same city, without feeling that there is no treatise on architecture which can claim rivalship with it. If the poor orphans were to study that science only, the millions lavished on the building would have been well expended. In this way, the dull rock becomes a Mentor; the dead brick cries out from the wall; the iron finger at the top of the steeple has nerves and sinews.

We are glad that another of these speechless yet eloquent teachers has taken his place on the banks of the Connecticut. We hope he will maintain it for ages. The solitary boatman on the river, as he launches his little skiff out of the Canadian forest, is quickly reminded, on either hand, that the invisible God is publicly adored. Soon the temple of science, on a picturesque little plain, as if inclosed "out of the world's wide wilderness," shows him that he is advancing into a region of high civilization. Descending a few hours more, a modest pile of stones is a remembrancer to him alike of Indian prowess, and of the spot where sleeps the flower of the county of Essex. Then, in the broad ex-

panse of the valley, "where the river glideth at its own sweet will," rise up other noble structures, whose fame, we hope, will grow greener from age to age. Hardly has he passed that solitary monument not made with hands, standing from century to century, as a faithful sentinel over a garden which is richer than the fabled Hesperides', when his eyes are again saluted with another goodly structure, designed to train up the living and fragrant flowers, not of the county of Essex merely, but of our common country.

A subject vitally important to the well-being of our land has now a permanent representative, a tangible, living impersonation, not dependent on a single human life, but to last while the river flows, and the guardian mountains reach towards it their aged arms. We are surrounded by signs, not to be mistaken, that the education of our dear countrywomen requires time, system, well-considered and well-directed effort.

II. Permanent female institutions will furnish opportunity to prosecute certain studies, which have hitherto been attended with but little practical advantage.

One of these studies is Mental Philosophy. Its importance it is hardly possible to exaggerate. It has been said that the ability to write well implies every thing else. The man who holds an effective pen has, necessarily, a logical understanding, disciplined taste, resources of knowledge, the power to illustrate, and a ready command of language. Thus it is with him who is familiar with the structure of his mind. He has the habit of patient attention. He knows the uses of his various intellectual faculties. No study so much combines the advantages of all others. It is theoretical and practical, equally conversant with the iron links of logic and the sunniest flowers of rhetoric. It gives one the

nicest tact in the use of language, while it teaches him that the aptest and most cunning words are no equivalent for massive thought.

A good definition of a complete education is this: It gives one the power to meet any exigency in the line of his profession; extent and exactness of knowledge; promptitude and pertinency in the use of it. So of a thorough and comprehensive acquaintance with mental science. It fits him for all conceivable emergencies. It supplies resources which a thousand calls of duty cannot exhaust, because he is always acquiring and classifying knowledge; while, in the application of it, he has an infallible guide in his sound judgment and correct taste.

The value of the study for *men* has never been denied. It forms an indispensable part of every complete and incomplete course of education. In some form or another, it is taught in every high school, college, and professional institution. But is it not of equal value in the intellectual discipline of females? Is it not fitted to their circumstances more perfectly than any other study?

Mrs. Hemans, speaking of Carlyle's criticism on the poet Burns, says, "Carlyle certainly gives us a great deal of 'bark and steel for the mind.' I, at least, found it in several passages; but I fear that a woman's mind never can be able, and never was formed to attain that sufficiency to itself, which seems to lie somewhere or other among the rocks of a man's." Now the study in question, though it might not impart, nor should we wish to have it impart, a *rocky* character to woman's intellectual nature, still would do more than any other single science to create that power of sufficiency to itself, the absence of which the poet asserts and deplores. How will it accomplish this?

First, by communicating that precise knowledge, the possession of which is always agreeable, and which contributes to that calmness of the spirits, that equanimity, which promotes self-reliance. While it supplies materials for meditation, it fits the mind to employ itself upon them; it furnishes both the means and instrument for self-reflection. A great cause of instability of character is intellectual poverty, want of materials of thought, or an exclusive dependence for enjoyment on the outward world. But by the habit of calm reflection on the processes of one's own mind, the creature of sense and impression learns to rely on a firmer prop. If this individuality of character, this power of self-control, is less developed in female character than in that of men, as Mrs. Hemans suggests, then no course of study could be more imperative than that whose immediate effect would be to supply the deficiency, by making the mind master of itself.

Again, the study imparts symmetry to the intellectual development. It represses every lordly tendency; it chastens all luxuriant growth; it spreads a delightful harmony over all the movements of the soul. There is, unquestionably, a stronger tendency in females than in the other sex, to the imaginative, or to the inordinate cultivation of the imagination. We do not object to a large and liberal nurture of this faculty. She has her uses, — her noble, her religious uses. She helps to sustain the soul in its searches for truth, as well as in its whole wearisome progress through this disciplinary state. She smooths the hard features of our lot. She plants flowers in the crevices of the rocks, which shed their fragrance upon us as we pass by. She encircles the unknown future with a strange interest. We are thus drawn upward in the strait path of duty, for she

does not necessarily mislead. Her offices are kind, and her hand is faithful. If she does not perform all her promises, it is only because richer and unimagined things are in store for us. She directly aids us, also, in the discovery of truth. How do we form our conceptions of the Divine attributes? Is it not by *imagining* human virtue, or human power, enlarged to their utmost limits? We cannot grasp abstract perfection by an effort of the understanding. All which we can do is to *imagine* the nearest approximation which we can make. He who has this power in the highest exercise, other things being equal, will form the most worthy conception of God. His eternity, — how could we gain our present faint idea of it, if we were deprived of the aid of imagination?

Still this aspiring faculty must be kept within her limits. She must not ascend the throne of the despot. She must not domineer, at least in our country, over the practical understanding. She must dwell with her fellow-inmates in all sisterly affection. She must be trained *along with* the other powers. There must be coherence, concinnity, completeness in educating the mind. The laws of the intellect must be patiently studied. Each faculty must receive its appropriate nourishment. In other words, there is no substitute for an ample training in the philosophy of the mind. Education, without it, will commonly be exclusive, ill-adjusted, and incomplete.

But in female schools, as hitherto managed, there has been no opportunity to prosecute this study. If a young lady can attend but one or two terms, her labor will ordinarily be lost, if she essays this difficult branch. It presupposes some discipline, some acquisition. Because a young lady can skilfully analyze a Latin verb, or a mountain flower,

it does not follow that she can read with advantage the second volume of Dugald Stewart. The latter can be grasped only by powers in a state somewhat mature. It is impossible for a fresh scholar, twelve or fourteen years old, to grapple with questions pertaining to the origin of language, or the nature of human testimony. Hence, many readers of Mr. Stewart are apt to retain nothing, except what he says upon wit, imagination, and the different kinds of memory; illustrating, perhaps, in their own case, this latter topic. It is but a small number, comparatively, of the members of a Senior class in college, who are able to reap decided benefit from the study in question. These few, if they revert to it in subsequent life, are often surprised, alike at the novelty of the thoughts, and at the feeble impression which the previous study made upon them.

Therefore we rejoice in the establishment of this Seminary. If the imperishable mind *itself* is worthy of patient investigation, then such an institution is of inestimable value. It supplies the only means by which a female education can be, in the highest sense, completed. Nothing short of a systematic, three-years' course can supply that preliminary training which is indispensable for the due appreciation of the labors of the mental philosopher.

III. One advantage of the establishment of a school like the Mount Holyoke Seminary, may be to counteract certain deleterious influences which are exerted on female education, and on the female character, by our large cities.

There can be no doubt that these influences are very great, and that they are fast increasing. The power that the cities of London and Paris exert over the whole civilized, and particularly over the whole fashionable world, cannot be calculated. The laws which emanate from the French mil-

liners reach over a hundred and seven and twenty provinces; and they are as despotic, for the time being, as his were who sat in Shushan the palace. In our own country every thing is tending towards centralization, to augment the number and the extent of cities. Boston, with its dozen iron arms, is drawing to itself the population of the country, and, with those same arms, reaching out to the dwellers on a thousand hills, the social and intellectual evils and blessings which cluster there. That this metropolitan influence is, in a measure, salutary, there can be no doubt. It promotes a higher order of civilization. It induces propriety and grace of manners. To a certain extent, and if kept within proper limits, it invests the human form with fresh attraction, and adds flexibility and sprightliness to the somewhat formal and rigid movement which is more peculiarly the growth of the country village.

But what the female population of large towns and cities gain in outward grace and personal accomplishment, they lose in more substantial qualities. The great tendency of a city life is to superficialness, — the cultivation of the showy and the ornamental to the neglect of that which is enduring and intrinsically valuable. The spiritual and the immortal are postponed to the fanciful and the temporary. It is a species of refined materialism; or, if it embraces aught which pertains to the higher part of our nature, it is conversant with certain faculties whose growth is apt to be inordinate, and whose sphere of operation is among things that are visible and evanescent. Light-mindedness, impatience of control, a shrinking from vigorous intellectual labor, do not, by any means, characterize all females who reside in our cities; but such is, unquestionably, the decided tendency of things.

This tendency is caused or fostered, in the first place, by the innumerable temptations to superficial reading, which are furnished from circulating libraries and other sources. Those who cannot purchase a standard work on history, can readily borrow the latest romance. Those who would regard Sharon Turner, or Mr. Hallam, as an intolerable annoyance, feel no compunction of conscience in devouring score after score of the productions of Bulwer, or of the feeble imitators of Walter Scott. Much of the religious literature, which swarms in the city bookstores, is no better. It is made up, in no small degree, of books which are a compilation for the thousandth time. No goldleaf was ever spread over an ampler surface than are their few thoughts. The mezzotint and the immaculate linen paper are the chief recommendations in many most popular volumes, which, by a misnomer, are termed religious. The birth-day and the new year's present is a miserable, brainless thing called an Annual. Who could be so audacious, as to propose to substitute for it a volume of Edmund Burke or of John Foster? The very hint of the expediency of such a measure would almost ostracize one from good society.

The tendency in question is increased by the arrangement, or rather disarrangement, of time, which prevails in cities. The morning hours, the country over, are dedicated to study. Vigor of mind is enjoyed, if at all, in the forenoon. It appears to be a universal law of our physical system, when it is in a healthful state. We know that some ministers and some lawyers study in the night. Alexander Hamilton labored on his bank bill, under the conjoint influence of the midnight hour and of strong coffee. But such is not the law. The products of these unseasonable hours will be, ordinarily, morbid in their character, if they do not

fail of their effect. The male or the female, who would aspire to the possession of a cultivated and well-furnished mind, must not, in general, permit the early hours of the day to pass unemployed. But, unhappily, such a disposition of time, in our cities, would seem to be impracticable. The conventional usages of society interpose an invincible obstacle. The order of nature is perfectly reversed. The evening is devoted to the popular lecture ; several succeeding hours are spent in the exciting festivities which are attendant on each season of the year. The first, and what may be called the intellectual portion of the following day, is employed in recovering the wasted energy, and in attendance upon the calls of fashion, which are alike brief, rapid, and heartless. It is this tyranny of custom which paralyzes intellect. It cuts off every favorable opportunity for self-education. Who can discipline her mind while subject to a law, the more despotic because it is unwritten? The weakness and indolence of human nature forbid us to expect, that there will be that self-control, and that love for intellectual pursuits, which will triumph over these formidable impediments.

The same effect is produced by the withdrawal from manual labor, from earnest physical employment, which prevails in the upper class, and in a large portion of the middle class, of the women of cities. The power of the mind is augmented by the exercise of the body. The healthful action of the brain, every one knows, depends on those causes which the indolent and the unemployed never set in motion. The younger females, particularly, need that sense of personal responsibility, and of the worth of time, which cannot be acquired, in general, except they have a regular task, an assigned physical labor to perform.

By the sweat of thy brow thou shalt be able to *think*, is as true as any proposition which can be stated.

There are, besides, certain general influences in a city which conspire to the same end. All things are in motion. It is the centre of news; it is the *terminus* of intelligence. It is a theatre for action. A thousand voices invite to effort, not to study. The immediately useful is the idol that most bow down to. Nothing can escape the rage for present effect. The groves of Plato's Academy would be cut down, if they stood in the way of a wharf; the Parthenon would be pulled over, if its stones could be converted into a custom-house; or if its site were convenient for a hay-market. Excitement is the order of the day. The passions, the sensibilities, are in danger of dislodging sober judgment and habits of patient study. What could be less wonderful than that the female portion of this bustling community should not be able to escape from the vortex? Hence we have, what we might expect, less intellectual energy, less solidity of character, among females in a city, than in the country. In other respects, they may be superior. They may win a more fervent admiration. They may approach nearer that ideal of female excellence which floats in the public mind. But the substantial elements of character certainly suffer deterioration. Most of the females, who have been distinguished for the higher qualities of mind, have been born and educated in the country.

Honor, therefore, to any one who resists this pernicious tendency. Prosperity to the institution that shall erect a barrier to the overwhelming and enervating effects of city fashions. Benefactors to their country are those who lay the structure of female education on an ample basis; who insist upon a well-proportioned and protracted course of dis-

cipline. A strong argument in favor of establishments like the one which we behold to-day, is their anti-metropolitan influence. If they have attendant evils, they are not such as are incident to a city. They proceed on the assumption, that the female mind is too noble in its origin, too sublime in its destiny, too exquisite in its structure, to be a mere automaton, moved by the impulses of a fond admiration, or the decrees of a blind fashion. They assume, what has always been allowed in respect to men, that a plan in education, well considered and coherent, is indispensable.

If we wish our countrywomen to be any thing but the slaves of the latest Parisian importations, or the mere idols of an hour, they must be taught patiently and perseveringly. Mind is the same in either sex, and everywhere. A symmetrical education and a useful life are not the creations of accident, either in man or woman.

IV. We argue, again, in favor of the systematic and protracted education of females, from one or two circumstances in the condition and prospects of the country.

We are no Cassandras. We do not like to be Micaiahs, — prophets of evil. We have strong hopes that the American experiment will succeed. We believe that the republican theory is the better, not only relatively, but absolutely. It has fitnesses, which nothing else has, to the nature and wants of man as such. Every year in our history proves this. The people of this country are not atheists. There is more fear of God pervading the public mind than we sometimes imagine. It may not appear on the surface. Deism may run to and fro along the great thoroughfares of our land. But when an exigency comes, when a terrible calamity intervenes, like that which we have just passed through, there are a thousand unexpected developments

which show that we are not altogether reprobate. We trust that our great country has not seen its best days. The working together of the true principles of freedom and of religion will at length exhibit a degree of prosperity, and a kind of national character, which the race have never yet seen.

But this consummation — to be desired above all things earthly — is to be brought about, if at all, by the thorough, comprehensive, Christian education of the people. Among the most imminent dangers are those which result from the jealousy and enmity of the different portions of the United States, menacing disunion ; and such as are the legitimate product of ignorance among the mass of the people. The remedies are to be found in an adequate intellectual and Christian training. That education is not worth much, which does not make its possessor charitable in his judgments, urbane, large-hearted, a lover of his country, — of every part of it. An *exclusive* cultivation of the mental powers may not have this effect; but the harmonious development of all the faculties of the soul *must* have such a tendency. A course of study like that pursued in the Mount Holyoke Seminary, if it could be extended into every State of the Union, would be one of the firmest props of that Union. No disorganizing influences ever emanate from it. No beetle-eyed prejudice, no narrow-minded bigotry, can find a home where the sciences are truly taught. The air which is breathed is too invigorating; the impulses which it prompts are too noble.

It will be equally potent in putting an end to ignorance. The religious delusions, which infest some large portions of our country, and which it is an insult to the human understanding even to name, are the rank growth of ignorance.

There is no end to these popular hallucinations, and there never will be, till a sound common-school education is the inheritance of the mass of the youth of our country; and until a large number of both sexes are enabled to pursue an ampler and more finished course. The best antidote for the new dispensation of military saints at Nauvoo, in Illinois, is the flourishing seminary, the Holyoke of the West, which has risen up in the same State. The education which is acquired in such schools, forms a well-balanced character, furnishes healthful employment for the mind, renders it skilful in detecting the lying wonders of the prophets of Baal, and gradually stations through the country those who will readily coöperate in extending the benefits of true science and of real religion. Such institutions are the antagonists of religious error, because they correct that intense craving for novelty, that passion for excitement on which the adroit impostor founds his system. It is not enough that *men* are thoroughly taught. The female portion of the community partake largely in the evils of these popular frenzies. Obvious causes make them peculiarly susceptible to influences of this nature. An ignorant and superstitious family supplies the materials on which the Latter-Day Saint operates to the greatest advantage. The sound, scientific, Scriptural education of the mothers and daughters and female school-teachers of our land, would furnish a most effectual safeguard against the repetition of scenes, which alike blast our honor and menace the existence of our valuable institutions.

We cannot close these already protracted remarks, without adverting to one or two objections, which are sometimes alleged against an extensive course of female education, like the one which we have now commended.

The most common and plausible objection, perhaps, is this. It will alienate the student from home-bred pleasures. She may have large stores of knowledge, but they will be earned at too great a cost. The discipline is not fitted to the peculiar sphere of duties in which she will be called to act.

This assumption we take the liberty to deny. It is not borne out by the experience of the past. Learning and domestic virtues have gone hand in hand. In every age, the best-educated females have been the best examples of all which is praiseworthy in social life. The lady of the great metaphysician of New England, in the last century, is one instance among a hundred which might be named. The Essay on the Freedom of the Human Will was the product of the leisure which she supplied.* The lady of Old England, who has carried her astronomical studies further than

* The lady of the great mathematician of New England merits a similar eulogy. In Dr. Bowditch's affecting dedication of his Translation of the Mécanique Céleste to his wife, it is stated, that without her approbation the work would never have been undertaken; and that it owes its completion to the fact, that she entirely relieved her husband from domestic care and anxiety by her admirable management.

Morus, in his Life of the celebrated Reiske, says: "The wife of Reiske, Ernestina Christiana Müller, was a singular instance of a woman united in a literary partnership with her husband, in addition to the love, faithfulness, amenity, truth, etc., which made her society very delightful. In describing and collating MSS., in digesting various readings, and in all the exhausting labors incident to an editor of ancient writers, she so assisted him that he had nothing more to desire." In the Preface to his edition of Demosthenes, Reiske gives her a warm and merited eulogy. The last three volumes were ably edited by her after his death. She was alike familiar with the ancient and modern languages. — *Vita Reiskii*, p. 38.

many educated men are able to follow her, revolves, in private life, in no starry sphere, but in a tranquil domestic orbit. The sweet singer of the Landing of the Pilgrims was never accused of any deficiency in filial or maternal duties. Indeed, in this last particular, she had a twofold task. It was practical and not poetic toil, which caused her sun to set ere it was yet noon. It was the every-day hardship of writing for bread, which extinguished those visions with which her imagination was instinct.

What we thus prove from indisputable facts, we might argue from the nature of the case. "It is not because individuals possess genius," says a great living writer, "that they make unhappy homes; but because they do not possess genius enough; a higher order of mind would enable them to see and feel all the beauty of domestic life." Learning or genius, in man or in woman, fits them for their duties, wherever they may be. There is no discrepancy between a thorough education and the hardest manual labor. Education, when we look at its very etymology, *draws out* the powers of the soul. Its result is a symmetrical character. True science is always modest and helpful. The tendency of good learning is to level all distinctions which are not founded in truth. It imparts dignity to every lawful pursuit. It surrounds *home* with new attractions. No one can enter into the meaning of that word so well as a scholar. It helps him to appreciate with a warmer interest the humble, and perhaps uneducated toilers there. She who makes learning any excuse for the omission of practical duties, may be sure that her learning is as scanty as her benevolence. The anti-domestic influence, which has been attributed to female schools, if it exists, is certainly the result of something besides learning. There has not been time for

the discipline of all the faculties, or some corroding prejudice has taken lodgment in the mind.*

There is another objection somewhat similar to the one which we have been considering. A course of study for females, framed substantially in accordance with that which is pursued at our colleges, will mar, it is said, that beautiful variety which now crowns the Creator's works. The graceful and the elegant in female character will be merged in that which is hard, muscular, and repulsive. An iron vigor of intellect will be a poor substitute for amenity of manners, refinement of sensibilities, and those thousand nameless qualities of the heart and the life which win esteem. We may have female philosophers or heroines, Maids of Orleans or Madame de Staëls; not Mrs. Huntingtons, nor De Broglies.

If such, however, should be the effect, it would be at variance with all reasonable expectation. In the present state of society, the amalgamation of the distinctive characteristics of the sexes is impossible; because, in opposition to it, there are certain general influences which are constantly at work. There is a decided public opinion which nothing can overcome. There is an innate sense of the propriety of these distinctions, which lies at the basis of that public sentiment. There is the irresistible agency of the world of

---

* We do not deny, that there are possible evils connected with a *protracted* and *public* course of female education. We think, however, that they can be obviated by a due measure of forethought and care on the part of the guardians and teachers of schools. If Mr. Isaac Taylor's ideas on "Home Education" could be reduced to practice in our country, we should anticipate happy results. But can we hope for this, at least in the present generation? How can that be communicated which is not possessed?

fashion, and the concurrent voice of the literature of all civilized nations. There never has been but one tribe of Amazons in fable; while there never was, and there never will be, one in history. The danger, therefore, which is apprehended, cannot be imminent. In order to realize the dreaded amalgamation, we must overturn the structure of society, run counter to the general sense of men, and annihilate some of the strongest impulses of our nature.

The objectors, to whom we refer, are often very inconsistent with themselves. They are accustomed to allude, in no very courteous terms, to the frivolous pursuits of females, and to the superficial character of their professed attainments in knowledge; and yet, when a proposition is made to impart to them an adequate intellectual discipline, they at once frown upon it as Utopian, or as contravening the order of nature, or the arrangements of Divine Providence.

Again, when an eminent statesman, scholar, or soldier, is the topic of conversation, their inference, almost invariably, is, that the genius of the son is owing to the genius of the mother. They leave the hero of a hundred battle-fields, in order to inquire into the character of the Corsican matron. They remember that he who was the Lord Chancellor of *nature*, as well as of England, grew up amid a constellation of female genius. They linger fondly over the memory of her who taught the greatest of American pulpit orators, — President Davies; and assert that it was to her strong mind and fervent prayer, that we owe this second Whitefield. But why, — if female education is of so little value, — why do they honor the *mother*, while recording the distinguished virtues of the *son*? Because their theory is overborne by facts. Unconsciously they bring forward

the highest possible testimony to the worth of that which they denounce.

But we are grateful for the evidence, that such cavillers do not abound here. We have solid proof, that the education of our countrywomen is, on *this* spot at least, duly honored. We rejoice in the noble testimony. We give thanks to a gracious Providence for what our eyes see, and our ears have heard. We adore that Holy Spirit whose converting grace descends, as it should seem, perennially, like the dew which distils on the mountains that are round about this daughter of Zion. We may be pardoned in adding, that but few names in our country will be had in more blessed remembrance than hers, who has carried a great and most benevolent object *through*, in the face of an unbelieving generation.

It *is* a benevolent object. It is the cultivation of the imperishable mind, of that which was made but a little lower than the angels. The youthful female who has a good intellectual and religious education, has every thing. She need not envy the dowry of the daughters of Crœsus, nor the fortune of her Transatlantic cousin, whose sceptre stretches over regions, on which, as her people like to boast, the sun never sets.

THE POETRY OF WORDSWORTH.*

We have a right to take for granted, that the poems of Wordsworth are not much appreciated on this side of the Atlantic. No inconsiderable part of a small edition of his Works, published in this city in 1824, remains unsold. The indifference to his writings is not confined to the prudent, the practical, the money-getting, nor to the light-minded and excitable. The men who profess to be able to relish good poetry, stand aloof. Those in whose lips Milton and Cowper are familiar words hold no communion with the living poet. We propose briefly to inquire into some of the causes of this general neglect.

It cannot be doubted that the shallow and contemptible criticisms, which appeared, fifteen or twenty years since, in the British Reviews, exerted considerable influence in this country. According to Blackwood, certainly sufficient au-

* This Essay was published in the Biblical Repository, January, 1836, as a Review of "The Poetical Works of William Wordsworth, in four volumes: Boston, Cummings, Hilliard, & Co., 1824, pp. 319, 368, 384, 382"; and "Yarrow Revisited, and other Poems, by William Wordsworth: Boston, James Munroe & Co., 1835, pp. 244."

thority, there has arisen but one good critic in Scotland, — the poet Beattie. So far as the earlier notices of Wordsworth are to be taken into the account, England will fall under the same condemnation. The public mind was everywhere prejudiced. To praise Wordsworth was to rise up in rebellion against the canons of legitimate criticism. It was nearly as safe for a Jew to be found with a New Testament in his pocket, as for an Englishman or American to be caught reading Wordsworth.* We were taught to shudder at the mention of the "*Lakes*," as though something very terrible or very silly was wrapped up in that word. These unfriendly criticisms were not short-lived in their effects. Literary slander does not easily die. No subsequent recantation can fully extract its venom. The Review has lived to confess its sins, but the minds of its readers were incurably poisoned.

Again, much of the poetry of Wordsworth is of a calm, severe, and finished character. He lays a tax on the patience, the considerateness, the religious reflection of his reader. He requires in him honesty of purpose, and a mind undimmed by passion or prejudice. The careless votary has nothing to do at the altar of this poet. But men of the school of Byron and Moore have been lords of the ascendant in this country, as well as in Britain. The mass of reading people have been crazed with the unnatural fictions of the royal or the Irish bard. The continent of Europe, for the last thirty years, has not been the scene of more incessant and inordinate excitement, than the minds of the great body of the enlightened population of Christendom.

* Even Sir James Mackintosh, remarkably liberal in his literary judgments, confesses that he had cherished a most unworthy prejudice against Wordsworth.

Men in this country, from whom we might have expected better things, have glided too much into the current. The cry is for action, vehement passion, immediate effect, and few have the courage to stop their ears. These thoughtful few even must sometimes join the multitude, lest they should be rebuked for sheer singularity. The soul requires little or no training to relish Byron. Unwashen guests may drink of the wine which he has mingled. But with Wordsworth it is the reverse. He has thought deeply and long. In the whole range of poetic literature, ancient and modern, we know not an instance of such patient attention, of such indefatigable meditation. Milton was a Commonwealth's man. Cowper brooded over his own crushed and helpless spirit. Thomson was a lover of indolence and of the good things of this life. Coleridge poured forth his gorgeous stores in conversation, and, though leaving works which shall never perish, died amidst magnificent unaccomplished projects. But Wordsworth has consecrated himself to his undertaking, with uncomplaining, unexampled, and iron diligence. Genius has been defined the power of hard thinking. The Poet, while he would reject this as an exclusive definition, has practically embraced it as an important part. In this fact there is much to account for the treatment which his volumes have received. His poems are not made to *please*, in the common use of that word. They require what the reader is not accustomed to yield.*

* Wordsworth thus contrasts Science and Poetry. "The man of science seeks truth as a remote and unknown benefactor; he cherishes and loves it in his solitude: the poet, singing a song in which all human beings join with him, rejoices in the presence of truth as our visible friend and hourly companion. Poetry is the breath and finer spirit of all knowledge; it is the impassioned expression which is in the

We fear, however, that the causes of this general dislike to Wordsworth lie deeper. We apprehend that there are certain things connected with the intellectual and active habits of the people of this country not wholly favorable to a proper estimate of a great poet. This tendency in the general mind is developed in various ways. There is a resolute repugnance to the authority of distinguished names. In past ages, concurrence in judgment on the part of a few leading minds was considered to be *probable* evidence of the soundness of that judgment. But such concurrence now is regarded as a suspicious circumstance. The illus-

---

countenance of all science. Emphatically may it be said of the poet, as Shakspeare hath said of man, 'that he looks before and after.' He is the rock of defence of human nature; an upholder and preserver, carrying everywhere with him relationship and love. In spite of difference of soil and climate, of language and manners, of laws and customs; in spite of things silently gone out of mind, and things violently destroyed; the poet binds together by passion and knowledge the vast empire of human society, as it is spread over the whole earth, and over all time. The objects of the poet's thoughts are everywhere: though the eyes and senses of men are, it is true, his favorite guides, yet he will follow wheresoever he can find an atmosphere of sensation in which to move his wings. Poetry is the first and last of all knowledge; it is as immortal as the heart of man. If the labors of men of science should ever create any material revolution, direct or indirect, in our condition, and in the impressions which we habitually receive, the poet will sleep then no more than at present, but he will be ready to follow the steps of the man of science, not only in those general indirect effects, but he will be at his side, carrying sensation into the midst of the objects of the science itself."

We leave our readers to judge whether the Poet, who has meditated so deeply and thought so well on the nature and objects of his vocation, as is indicated in the above passage, will not be likely to write poetry worthy of attention.

trious dead are dragged forth to meet the ordeal of a keen and unsanctified criticism. We cannot comfort ourselves with the memory of Socrates, but we must be confronted with the charges of some sophist or some tanner. We cannot exalt the human mind by recalling the names of Lord Bacon and of Robert Hall, but at the risk of hearing bribery laid at the door of the one, and opium-eating at that of the other. Every point in the moral character of a great man must be vindicated, before we can touch the productions which he has left as a precious legacy for all time.

This habit of eagle-eyed and unhallowed criticism prevails in this country. A great name must have some opprobrious mark attached to it, because the man who wears that name is not absolutely perfect, or because the ardor of true genius has not been, in every instance, united to a most scrupulous accuracy. Now when we open the pages of an author of any repute, we need to cherish reverence and humility. We must have some faith in his power to enlighten and instruct us. We must not carry a hard heart in our bosoms, nor a tomahawk in our hands. We must throw aside prejudice, and be ready to weigh, inwardly digest, love, and treasure up. Wordsworth has spent a long life in the study of his noble art. He is *educated* in the mysteries of his calling. In addition to a large measure of natural sensibility, he has qualified himself by a patient study of nature and of the human faculties. Is he then not entitled to our confidence? May we not challenge for him, as a passport to his writings, what multitudes in our days are so willing to abjure, — a worthy name, a high authority?

There is, moreover, in this country, too much of *sectarian* judgment. An author must be of our political or religious creed, or we cannot tolerate him. He must entertain pre-

cisely the same notions with ourselves on the questions of liberty, church and state, the authority of bishops, etc. If one of another communion furnishes a book of poetry, our first questions are: Does he believe in the divine right of kings? Is he sufficiently anti-popish? Is there not some political or religious heresy couched under his hexameters? Such extreme suspiciousness shows that we are in some doubt about the foundations of our own faith. It also indicates a state of heart totally unfit to come into the presence of a master-spirit of our race. It may be important, in some respects, to know that Lord Bacon was a churchman, and a chancellor, and not wholly free from the sin of believing in alchemy. But what have these things to do with the general estimate of his writings? So of Wordsworth. His views on church government, and on republicanism, may not coincide with those generally entertained in this country. But can we not rise superior to such considerations? Is he not a man and a poet? Does he not treat of *human* sympathies? Does he not speak a universal language? Has he not shed a benign light on the truth which is never to perish, — on questions interesting to man in all states and stages of his being? We look on the poet as the benefactor of our race. In perusing his works, we feel a new interest, not alone in our English descent; a new bond of affection, not alone for our mother speech. The poet has enlarged the sphere of human knowledge; he has quickened the sympathies of our common humanity.

We may be permitted to mention, that the unsettled state of the public mind in this country, on many questions in mental and moral philosophy, is unfavorable to a due appreciation of Wordsworth. The Poet is a philosopher. He has studied hard and thought clearly. His poems are con-

structed on fixed principles. He has not judged it worth while to write at random, in fits of inspiration, without any well-considered plan, or any determinate object. He has higher ideas of his vocation than to trust to some lucky moment, or to ring changes on a few set phrases. No intelligent man can read his Prefaces and Notes, without being convinced that the Poet has accurately studied the mental and moral faculties. Whether his doctrines are right or wrong, he has well considered them, and has made them the foundation of his claim as a poet. We do not say that the reader must think in all respects like his author, in order to derive pleasure and instruction from his writings. Wordsworth has many detached passages of singular power and beauty, open to the comprehension and love of all. The deep pathos and perfect nature of nearly the whole of the first two books of the Excursion, will find a response in every heart which is not utterly dead. But a deeper meaning frequently pervades a poem. Fine views of thought intertwine themselves in the texture of a piece, which is outwardly unassuming and simple. This is eminently the case in the poems where imagination and reflection are predominant. It is not required of an author, that he should at all times remain on a level with an indolent reader's comprehension. There are passages in the Hebrew Scriptures, and in Milton, which, wholly apart from their costume, require from him who opens the page the closest study. The groundwork of the poem, the nature of the conception, will not be obvious to an unreflecting mind. Now, among the mass of educated people in this country, there is no distinct apprehension of the peculiar merits of Wordsworth, because they have not themselves any clear conception of the powers of mind requisite in the production of poetry.

They have never studied their own powers. To habits of calm meditation upon the laws of their own inward being, they are strangers. This may not be altogether their own fault. So far as we understand the case, there is no predominant system of ethics, or of mental philosophy, in the country. Paley is taught in some of our colleges, rather because his errors furnish a good starting-point for the teacher's lecture or questions, than from any belief in his doctrines. Locke and Dr. Brown retain a doubtful supremacy in some institutions, while in others Dugald Stewart is recovering his lost honors. Consequently, the minds of pupils are afloat on these great subjects. When a poet appears, who claims to be a philosopher, who asserts that genuine poetry is as permanent as pure science, who maintains that a poet "binds together by knowledge and passion the vast empire of human society, as it is spread over the whole earth, and over all time," he cannot in such society receive a general and cordial welcome. Milton was little heard of in England till more than one hundred and fifty years after the publication of his poems. In eleven years only three thousand copies of Paradise Lost were sold. Only two editions of the Works of Shakspeare were sold in more than forty years, from 1623 to 1664. Spenser, if known, is scarcely read in the United States. His Faerie Queene has not been republished in this country, so far as our knowledge extends. Who is found reading the Canterbury Tales of Chaucer, or the Reliques of Ancient English Poetry?

This leads us to remark, that the powers of the English language are not understood as they should be, for the proper mastery of a poet like Wordsworth. The history of some English words, it has been remarked, is worth more

than the history of a campaign. Many words in Paradise Lost are absolutely insusceptible of exchange. Removal destroys the stanza. So in some of Wordsworth's sonnets. There is a perfect adaptation between the word and the sentiment. It lies in its place like apples of gold in pictures of silver. In other cases, a knowledge of the history or of the etymology of a word or a phrase is needed, in order to the full appreciation of the stanza or the poem in which it is found. This is not, however, the age of logical precision in the use of language. The scholar is not often directed to study the models of severe classical beauty. Immediate, practical effect is the object. Any approximation towards a perfect style is regarded as unattainable, or perhaps undesirable. Some of the leading periodical publications are, in our opinion, fast corrupting the language. Every thing is thrown off in a smart, dashing, impetuous style. Keen, lively, pointed sallies of wit or nonsense, as the case may be, are substituted for such English as Addison and Playfair have given us. Truth is made to bow at the shrine of vigorous writing. Originality is considered as synonymous with odd terms in a sentence, or with singular combinations of phraseology. Some of the British Magazines are filled with humorous articles, greedily republished in this country, which are a motley mixture of profaneness, staring exclamation-points, personal scandal, innuendoes, and all other things, which can show the emptiness of the writer's brain, or degrade the language in which he professes to write. We must go back to former days, when Bates and Jeremy Taylor and Leighton and Milton gave us specimens of the mature strength and finished beauty of the English tongue, when both the Saxon and the Greek roots were duly honored, when massive richness of thought was

equalled by the sweet music or the consummate finish of the diction. Wordsworth belongs to the old school in this respect. He cannot be entirely appreciated by such persons as are indifferent to language. His words are not simply the costume of his thoughts, but, in many instances at least, are an integral part of those thoughts. We will give a specimen or two.

"COMPOSED UPON WESTMINSTER BRIDGE,
SEPTEMBER 3, 1803.

"Earth has not any thing to show more fair:
Dull would he be of soul, who could pass by
A sight so touching in its majesty.
This city now doth like a garment wear
The beauty of the morning; silent, bare,
Ships, towers, domes, theatres, and temples lie
Open unto the fields, and to the sky;
All bright and glittering in the smokeless air.
Never did sun more beautifully steep
In his first splendor, valley, rock, or hill;
Ne'er saw I, never felt, a calm so deep!
The river glideth at his own sweet will!
Dear God! the very houses seem asleep;
And all that mighty heart is lying still."

Who could attempt to displace any word in that sonnet? How thoroughly Saxon in etymology! How select the epithets! How distinct is every picture, and yet how compact the whole great effect! Listen to the following noble apostrophe.

"1802.

"Milton! thou shouldst be living at this hour;
England hath need of thee; she is a fen
Of stagnant waters; altar, sword, and pen,

Fireside, the heroic wealth of hall and bower,
Have forfeited their ancient, English dower
Of inward happiness. We are selfish men;
O, raise us up; return to us again,
And give us manners, virtue, freedom, power!
Thy soul was like a Star, and dwelt apart;
Thou hadst a voice whose sound was like the sea;
Pure as the naked heavens, majestic, free,
So didst thou travel on life's common way,
In cheerful godliness; and yet thy heart
The lowliest duties on herself did lay."

Who that has read "meek Walton" will not answer to the perfect truth of the following?

"WALTON'S BOOK OF 'LIVES.'

"There are no colors in the fairest sky
So fair as these. The feather, whence the pen
Was shaped that traced the lives of these good men,
Dropped from an angel's wing. With moistened eye
We read of faith and purest charity
In statesman, priest, and humble citizen.
O, could we copy their mild virtues, then
What joy to live, what blessedness to die!
Methinks their very names shine still and bright,
Apart, like glow-worms in the woods of spring,
Or lonely tapers shooting far a light
That guides and cheers, — or seem, like stars on high,
Satellites burning in a lucid ring
Around meek Walton's heavenly memory."

In the last volume of Wordsworth are some exquisite stanzas on "The Power of Sound." Here are the last three. The first alludes to the Pythagorean theory of numbers and music, with their supposed power over the motions of the universe.

"By one pervading spirit
Of tones and numbers all things are controlled,
As sages taught, where faith was found to merit
Initiation in that mystery old.
The heavens, whose aspects make our minds as still
As they themselves *appear* to be,
Innumerable voices fill
With everlasting harmony;
The towering headlands, covered with mist,
Their feet among the billows, know
That ocean is a mighty harmonist;
Thy pinions, universal air,
Ever waving to and fro,
Are delegates of harmony, and bear
Strains that support the seasons in their round;
Stern winter loves a dirge-like sound.

"Break forth into thanksgiving,
Ye banded instruments of wind and chords!
Unite, to magnify the Ever-living,
Your inarticulate notes with the voice of words!
Nor hushed be service from the lowing mead,
Nor mute the forest hum of noon.
Thou too be heard, lone eagle! freed
From snowy peak and cloud, attune
Thy hungry barkings to the hymn
Of joy, that from her utmost walls
The six days' work, by flaming seraphim,
Transmits to heaven! As deep to deep
Shouting through one valley calls,
All worlds, all natures, mood and measure keep
For praise and ceaseless gratulation, poured
Into the ear of God, their Lord!

"A voice to light gave being;
To time, and man, his earth-born chronicler:

A voice shall finish doubt and dim foreseeing,
And sweep away life's visionary stir ;
The trumpet, (we, intoxicate with pride,
Arm at its blast for deadly wars,)
To archangelic lips applied,
The grave shall open, quench the stars.
O Silence! are man's noisy years
No more than moments of thy life?
Is Harmony, blest queen of smiles and tears,
With her smooth tones and discords just
Tempered into rapturous strife,
Thy destined bond-slave? No! though earth be dust,
And vanish, though the heavens dissolve, her stay
Is in the WORD ; that shall not pass away."

The poem entitled "Tintern Abbey," under the head of Poems of the Imagination, is inexpressibly affecting. We can copy but a short paragraph.

"I have learned
To look on nature, not as in the hour
Of thoughtless youth ; but hearing oftentimes
The still, sad music of humanity,
Nor harsh, nor grating, though of ample power
To chasten and subdue. And I have felt
A presence that disturbs me with the joy
Of elevated thoughts ; a sense sublime
Of something far more deeply interfused,
Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns,
And the round ocean, and the living air,
And the blue sky, and in the mind of man ;
A motion and a spirit, that impels
All thinking things, all objects of all thought,
That rolls through all things. Therefore am I still
A lover of the meadows, and the woods,
And mountains ; and of all that we behold

From this green earth ; of all the mighty world
Of eye and ear, both what they half create,
And what perceive ; well pleased to recognize
In nature and the language of the sense,
The anchor of my purest thoughts, the nurse,
The guide, the guardian of my heart, and soul
Of all my moral being."

One effect of an acquaintance with the writings of Mr. Wordsworth will be to enlarge the mind, free it from unworthy prejudices, and teach it to hold familiar communion with all the great and good of the race. How noble in such men to be devoid of envy. Hear him speak of his early calumniators: "They may have affected my fortune, and thus my enjoyments and my means of doing good ; but they have never wounded my feelings, for I never wrote for popular applause. I felt that the time would come when justice would be done ; and now I have that justice ; now, when the reward is most sweet, as I am about to end my days." His last volume is dedicated to the poet Rogers. The stanzas entitled "Yarrow Revisited" are a memorial of a day passed with Sir Walter Scott, and other friends visiting the banks of the Yarrow, under his guidance, immediately before his departure from Abbotsford for Naples, in 1831. In the Notes and Prefaces of the poet, there is frequent and honorable mention of men, whom a weak or envious mind would have slandered or passed by in silence. He thus writes of an excellent lady, whose "Letters to the Young," and "Four Histories," some of our readers may have seen: "She accompanied her husband, the Rev. William Fletcher, to India, and died of cholera, at the age of thirty-two or thirty-three years, on her way from Shalapore to Bombay, deeply lamented by all who knew her.

Her enthusiasm was ardent, her piety steadfast; and her great talents would have enabled her to be eminently useful in the difficult path of life to which she had been called. The opinion she entertained of her own performances, given to the world under her maiden name, Jewsbury, was modest and humble, and, indeed, far below their merits; as is often the case with those who are making trial of their powers with a hope to discover what they are best fitted for. In one quality, namely, quickness in the motions of her mind, she was, in the author's estimation, unequalled."

How different such comments from the magisterial decisions which have sometimes crushed youthful genius in the germ! How much nearer to the idea of Christian charity, in this particular, are Scott, Southey, and Wordsworth, than not a few professedly religious writers!

In the article of moral purity, there are but few poets in the English language who are meet to be compared with Wordsworth. This delicacy never degenerates into prudery or a sickly sentimentality, such as a recluse of the Middle Ages might have exhibited. Neither is it a cold and negative morality, an absence of positive infraction of the laws of conscience, such as appears in some of the Essays of Hume. It flows from a heartfelt recognition of the standard of right. It is that good breeding, which has the moral law for its basis, far removed from every thing capricious or conventional. Throughout the five volumes there is a nice sense of justice; careful, discriminating, delicate touches of domestic life; entire freedom from the use of language which tends to confound important distinctions; an extraordinary clearness both of mental and of moral perceptions.

In what sense Wordsworth is a religious poet, will be

apparent from subsequent extracts. He is an earnest supporter and a devout member of the Church of England. The government, the rites and ceremonies, the doctrines, and all the glorious recollections of that communion, are cherished themes, and pervade much of his poetry. Whether he might not have more distinctly recognized the great truth of the Christian system, we shall not now attempt to decide. The spiritual being of man, his dependence and moral weakness, his immortality, the glories of the Divine Existence, are illustrated frequently and with great force. With some expressions of the early moral innocence of children, the efficacy of the initiatory Christian rite, and the tenderness with which some errors are mentioned, we cannot sympathize. The language at least is liable to misconstruction, and it does not well accord with sentiments elsewhere exhibited. Wordsworth will be read in the better days of the Christian Church. His pure strains will be a feast to regenerate spirits. Beside Spenser and Milton and Cowper, he may take his seat on the hill of Zion. For the world's benefit, we are anxious that he should be fully identified with the *elect spirits*. Long has he contended for this high distinction. Sweet and immortal his reward!

Among the poems entitled "Inscriptions" is the following.

"Not seldom, clad in radiant vest,
Deceitfully goes forth the morn;
Not seldom evening in the west
Sinks smilingly forsworn.

"The smoothest seas will sometimes prove
To the confiding bark untrue;
And, if she trust the stars above,
They can be treacherous too.

"The umbrageous oak, in pomp outspread,
Full oft, when storms the welkin rend,
Draws lightning down upon the head
It promised to defend.

"But Thou art true, Incarnate Lord!
Who didst vouchsafe for man to die;
Thy smile is sure, thy plighted word
No change can falsify!

"I bent before thy gracious throne,
And asked for peace with suppliant knee;
And peace was given, — nor peace alone,
But faith, and hope, and ecstasy."

How calm and Christian-like is this, from the "Evening Voluntaries," in his last volume!

"The sun, that seemed so mildly to retire,
Flung back from distant climes a streaming fire,
Whose breeze is now subdued to tender gleams,
Prelude of night's approach with soothing dreams.
Look round! of all the clouds not one is moving;
'T is the still hour of thinking, feeling, loving.
Silent, and steadfast as the vaulted sky,
The boundless plain of waters seems to lie.
Comes that low sound from breezes rustling o'er
The grass-crowned headland that conceals the shore?
No, 't is the earth-voice of the mighty sea,
Whispering how meek and gentle he *can* be!

"Thou Power supreme! who, arming to rebuke
Offenders, dost put off the gracious look,
And clothe thyself with terrors like the flood
Of ocean roused into his fiercest mood,
Whatever discipline thy will ordain
For the brief course that must for me remain,

Teach me with quick-eared spirit to rejoice
In admonitions of thy softest voice!
Whate'er the path these mortal feet may trace,
Breathe through my soul the blessing of thy grace,
Glad through a perfect love, a faith sincere
Drawn from the wisdom that begins with fear;
Glad to expand, and for a season, free
From finite cares, to rest absorbed in Thee."

At the close of the Excursion is the following sublime address to the Deity. It deserves a place along with Milton's, Thomson's, and Derzhaven's. It speaks to the inmost soul.

"Eternal Spirit! universal God!
Power inaccessible to human thought
Save by degrees and steps which Thou hast deigned
To furnish! for this Image of Thyself,
To the infirmity of mortal sense
Vouchsafed, — this local, transitory type
Of thy paternal splendors, and the pomp
Of those who fill thy courts in highest heaven,
The radiant Cherubim, — accept the thanks
Which we, thy humble creatures, here convened,
Presume to offer; we, who, from the breast
Of the frail earth permitted to behold
The faint reflections only of thy face,
Are yet exalted, and in soul adore.
Such as they are, who in thy presence stand
Unsullied, incorruptible, and drink
Imperishable majesty streamed forth
From thy empyreal Throne, the elect of earth
Shall be, divested at the appointed hour
Of all dishonor, cleansed from mortal stain.
Accomplish, then, their number; and conclude
Time's weary course! Or if, by thy decree

The consummation that will come by stealth
Be yet far distant, let thy Word prevail,
Oh! let thy Word prevail, to take away
The sting of human nature. Spread the Law,
As it is written in thy holy Book,
Throughout all lands: let every nation hear
The high behest, and every heart obey;
Both for the love of purity, and hope,
Which it affords to such as do thy will,
And persevere in good, that they shall rise,
To have a nearer view of Thee, in heaven.
Father of Good! this prayer in bounty grant,
In mercy grant it to thy wretched sons.
Then, nor till then, shall persecution cease,
And cruel wars expire. The way is marked,
The guide appointed, and the ransom paid.
Alas! the nations, who of yore received
These tidings, and in Christian temples meet
The sacred truth to acknowledge, linger still;
Preferring bonds and darkness to a state
Of holy freedom, by redeeming love
Proffered to all, while yet on earth detained.
So fare the many; and the thoughtful few,
Who in the anguish of their souls bewail
This dire perverseness, cannot choose but ask,
Shall it endure? Shall enmity and strife,
Falsehood and guile, be left to sow their seed,
And the kind never perish? Is the hope
Fallacious, or shall righteousness obtain
A peaceable dominion, wide as earth,
And ne'er to fail? Shall that blest day arrive
When they, whose choice or lot it is to dwell
In crowded cities, without fear shall live
Studious of mutual benefit; and he,
Whom morning wakes, among sweet dews and flowers

Of every clime, to till the lonely field,
Be happy in himself? The law of faith,
Working through love, such conquest shall it gain,
Such triumph over sin and guilt achieve?
Almighty Lord, thy further grace impart!
And with that help the wonder shall be seen
Fulfilled, the hope accomplished; and thy praise
Be sung with transport and unceasing joy.

"Whence but from Thee, the true and only God,
And from the faith derived through Him who bled
Upon the cross, this marvellous advance
Of good from evil; as if one extreme
Were left, — the other gained? O ye, who come
To kneel devoutly in yon reverend pile,
Called to such office by the peaceful sound
Of Sabbath bells; and ye, who sleep in earth,
All cares forgotten, round its hallowed walls!
For you, in presence of this little band
Gathered together on the green hill-side,
Your pastor is emboldened to prefer
Vocal thanksgivings to the Eternal King;
Whose love, whose counsel, whose commands, have made
Your very poorest rich in peace of thought
And in good works; and him, who is endowed
With scantiest knowledge, master of all truth
Which the salvation of his soul requires.
Conscious of that abundant favor showered
On you, the children of my humble care, —
On your abodes, and this beloved land,
Our birthplace, home, and country, while on earth
We sojourn, — loudly do I utter thanks
With earnest joy, that will not be suppressed.
These barren rocks, your stern inheritance;
These fertile fields that recompense your pains;

The shadowy vale, the sunny mountain-top;
Woods waving in the wind their lofty heads,
Or hushed; the roaring waters, or the still;
They see the offering of my lifted hands:
They hear my lips present their sacrifice:
They know if I be silent, morn or even:
For, though in whispers speaking, the full heart
Will find a vent; and thought is praise to Him,
Audible praise to Thee, Omniscient Mind,
From whom all gifts descend, all blessings flow!"

Very few poets are more *practical* than Wordsworth. His pages are crowded with sententious maxims, with clear, compact, and beautifully expressed truths. We will take a few at random.

"O Sir! the good die first;
And they, whose hearts are dry as summer dust,
Burn to the socket."

"But know we not that he, who intermits
The appointed task and duties of the day,
Untunes full oft the pleasures of the day,
Checking the finer spirits that refuse
To flow, when purposes are lightly changed?"

"The food of hope
Is meditated action; robbed of this,
Her sole support, she languishes and dies."

"Rightly is it said,
That man descends into the VALE of years;
Yet have I thought that we might also speak,
And not presumptuously, I trust, of age,
As of a final EMINENCE, though bare
In aspect, and forbidding, yet a point
On which 't is not impossible to sit

In awful sovereignty, — a place of power, —
A throne, which may be likened unto his,
Who, in some placid day of summer, looks
Down from a mountain-top."

"Our life is turned
Out of her course, wherever man is made
An offering, or a sacrifice, a tool
Or implement, a passive thing employed
As a brute mean, without acknowledgment
Of common right or interest in the end."

"The primal duties shine aloft, like stars;
The charities, that soothe, and heal, and bless,
Are scattered at the feet of man, like flowers."

"Say, what is *honor?* 'T is the finest sense
Of *justice* which the human mind can frame,
Intent each lurking frailty to disclaim,
And guard the way of life from all offence
Suffered or done."

"Sweetest melodies
Are those that are by distance made more sweet.
Whose mind is but the mind of his own eyes,
He is a slave: the meanest we can meet!

Our limits forbid us to proceed further. The task is pleasant, and we have not known where to stop, or what to extract. Our copy of the Excursion is full of pencillings. Then there are the "Brothers," "Ode on the Intimations of Immortality from the Recollections of Childhood," "Ode to Duty," several of the "Sonnets to Liberty," and the "Evening Voluntaries," in the last volume; all of these we should have been glad to copy. It is truly refreshing to read such poetry. It calms the spirit, and fills it with

charity towards all mankind. It is employing the music of angels in impressing great truths on the mind. It purifies the domestic affections, and fills them with a serene and blessed light. It prepares the mind for the worship of the only FAIR, and the only GOOD. It teaches to discriminate sacred poetry with true taste. Wordsworth, like Milton, is a Hebrew in soul. He knows well how to play on "David's harp of solemn sound."

We ought, perhaps, to suggest to our readers the importance of studying the Prefaces of Wordsworth. To a full appreciation of his merits they are indispensable. If the reader should not agree with all the positions there laid down, it is but right that the Poet should be heard on a subject which he has closely studied for forty or fifty years, and eloquently illustrated. We had prepared a view of his theory, with corresponding illustrative extracts from his poems, but on the whole concluded it best to withhold it. If what we have done shall be the means of directing one of our readers to the writings of this truly great poet, from whose pen have flowed

> "The highest, holiest raptures of the lyre,
> And wisdom married to immortal verse,"

we shall receive an abundant reward.

REASONS FOR THE STUDY OF THE HEBREW LANGUAGE.*

THE sixth article of the Constitution of this Seminary prescribes, that under the head of Sacred Literature shall be included "Lectures on the formation, preservation, and transmission of the sacred volume; on the languages in which the Bible was originally written; on the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, and on the peculiarities of the language and style of the New Testament, resulting from this version and other causes; on the history, character, use, and authority of the versions and manuscripts of the Old and New Testaments; on the canons of Biblical criticism; on the authority of the several books of the sacred code; on the apocryphal books of both Testaments; on modern translations of the Bible, more particularly on the history and character of our English version; and also critical lectures on the various readings and difficult passages in the sacred writings."

This may justly be regarded as a comprehensive and well-condensed statement of the main points in a course of

* This Address was delivered by Professor Edwards, at his Inauguration into the Professorship of Hebrew Literature at Andover, January 18th, 1838, and was published in the Biblical Repository, July, 1838.

sacred literature. It may, possibly, be considered as an uncommonly liberal outline, if we take into account the period in which it was framed. It would have received, however, the cordial subscription of the earliest planters of New England.

John Cotton, the first minister of Boston, was able to converse in Hebrew.* Of Samuel Whiting, of Lynn, it was said, "that he was especially accurate in Hebrew, in which primitive and expressive language he took great delight." Of the very first settlers of Massachusetts Bay, not less than twenty had been educated at the English universities. The appointed course of studies in Harvard College, at its origin, embraced Hebrew, Chaldee, and Syriac.† Mr. Dunster, the first President, was understood to have been well acquainted with the Oriental languages.‡ Mr. Chauncy, his successor, was admirably skilled in the learned languages, particularly the Oriental. In his acquisition of the

* "Wherein this is not unworthy the taking notice of, that when the poser came to examine him in the Hebrew tongue, the place that he took trial of him by was that Isaiah iii., against the excessive bravery of the haughty daughters of Zion; which hath more hard words in it, than any place of the Bible within so short a compass; and therefore, though a present construction and resolution thereof might have put a good Hebrician to a stand, yet such was his dexterity, as made those difficult words facile, and rendered him a prompt respondent." — *Life of Cotton, by John Norton.*

† "The fifth day reads Hebrew, and the Easterne Tongues. Grammar to the first yeare, houre the 8th. To the 2d, Chaldee, at the 9th houre. To the 3d, Syriack at the 10th houre. Afternoone. The first yeare practise in the Bible at the 2d houre. The 2d, in Ezra and Daniel, at the 3d houre. The 3d, at the 4th houre, in Trostius New Testament." — *New England's First Fruits.* London, 1643.

‡ It was on this account, probably, that he was employed to "revise and publish the Bay Psalm Book," printed at Cambridge in 1640.

Hebrew he derived no small benefit, during the space of a year, from the conversation of a Jew. He was the friend of Archbishop Usher, and had been successively Professor of Hebrew, and of Greek, at the University of Cambridge, England. When he attended prayers in the hall at Harvard College, in the morning, he usually expounded a chapter of the Old Testament, which was first read from Hebrew by one of his pupils; and in the evening, a chapter of the New Testament, read from the Greek. Thomas Thacher, the first minister of the Old South Church, Boston, having spent several years under the tuition of President Chauncy, while the latter was minister of Scituate, became well skilled in Arabic, Syriac, and Hebrew; in the last-named language he composed a lexicon.* The thesis, which Cotton Mather maintained, when he received his second degree, was "the divine origin of the Hebrew points," though he afterwards saw reason to change his mind, and to hold to the contrary opinion to the last. During seven years after his graduation, he prepared students for admission to college, hearing recitations every day in the original Scriptures, giving particular attention to the Hebrew.

In the burying-ground in the town of Northborough, in this State, there is a monument, on which the following is the inscription in part:

> "A native branch of Judah see,
> Which, once from off its olive broke,
> Regrafted from the living tree,
> Of the reviving sap partook."

This "native branch" was Judah Monis, the first regular instructor of Hebrew at Harvard College. He was by birth

* Wisner's Hist. of the Old South Church, p. 12.

and religion a Jew, but embraced the Christian faith, and was publicly baptized at Cambridge, in 1722. The Rev. Dr. Benjamin Colman, of Boston, preached a sermon on the occasion, which was published. In the preface, he remarks, that "Mr. Monis is a master and critic in the Hebrew. He reads, speaks, writes, and interprets it with great readiness and accuracy, and is truly διδακτικός, *apt to teach*. His diligence and industry, together with his ability, are known unto many, who have seen his Grammar and Nomenclator, Hebrew and English, as also his translation of the Creed and the Lord's Prayer, the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England, and the Assembly's Shorter Catechism into Hebrew." * For his Hebrew Grammar the Corporation paid him £35. He made use of the vowel-points in this Grammar, and insisted that they were essential to the right pronunciation of the language. He resigned his office in 1760. On the 7th of September, in the same year, the Corporation voted, "that *Sir* Sewall be the Hebrew instructor in Harvard College this year." He was rechosen in 1762 and 1763. In 1764 the Hancock Professorship of the Hebrew and other Oriental Languages was established, from a legacy of Thomas Hancock, an opulent merchant of Boston, who died August 1, 1764. This was the first professorship founded in America by a native. Stephen Sewall

* It was voted by the Corporation, April 30th, 1722, "that Mr. Judah Monis be *improved* as an instructor in the Hebrew language in the College," and that his salary for one year should be £70. All the undergraduates, except the Freshmen and such others as should be exempted by the Faculty, were required to attend his instructions on four days in the week. He was rechosen in 1723, and in 1724. He then appears to have become a permanent instructor. See Worcester Magazine, II. 180, and Peirce's Hist. of Harvard University, p. 232.

was elected the first professor on this foundation. His qualifications for the office were so preëminent, that he was probably the only one who was thought of to fill it. Besides his instructions in Hebrew and Chaldee, he was required to teach, in a more private way, such students as should desire it, in the Samaritan, the Syriac, and the Arabic. No American, previously, had acquired so extensive an acquaintance with Eastern learning as Professor Sewall. His Greek odes were praised by the English reviewers. He corresponded with Kennicott and other learned foreign Orientalists. He prepared a Greek Prosody and Lexicon, a Hebrew Grammar, a Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon (now in manuscript in the library of Harvard University), and pushed his studies into the Ethiopic and Persian.

President Stiles speaks of Dr. Cutler, the second Rector of Yale College, as a "great Hebrician and Orientalist." The vehement literary ardor of Dr. Stiles himself is well known. He would actually compass sea and land to get the sight of a Jewish rabbi, or a piece of vellum. In May, 1767, says his biographer, Dr. Holmes, he commenced the study of the Hebrew. In the first five days, he read the Psalms. In one month, he translated all the Psalms from Hebrew into Latin. In 1768, he commenced Arabic, Syriac, Chaldee, and Rabbinic. In 1769, he copied an Arabic volume, and translated it from the original. He then, as he terms it, "dipped into Persian and Coptic."

During the latter part of the last century, however, the interest in Oriental literature had greatly declined. The study of Hebrew was not, indeed, entirely neglected in the colleges which more recently came into existence. Professor John Smith, of Dartmouth College, gave instruction in Hebrew, and compiled a grammar of the language.

The knowledge of Eastern learning, possessed by the fathers of New England, was doubtless, in some instances, curious and ill-digested, possibly superficial, rather than profound and practical. When we take into account, however, the ruggedness of the times, the pressure of other and indispensable duties, and the very imperfect lexical and grammatical helps, we cannot but be astonished that so much progress was made. More attention, comparatively, was bestowed on the study of Hebrew during the first fifty years after the settlement of New England, than has been given to it at any subsequent period, not excepting the present century. No generation of Biblical students has arisen in England, which can be compared to the Ushers, the Seldens, the Lightfoots, the Pococks, the Castells, and the Waltons of the middle of the seventeenth century. Dr. Lightfoot gave his invaluable Oriental library to Harvard College. The flame of sacred learning which rose high in their Trinity and Immanuel, was rekindled on our wintry shores and amid our unbroken forests. Our fathers did not avail themselves of the common excuse, want of time, for the neglect of the study in question. One of these venerable men, who had read himself blind, and who was accustomed to derive consolation from the thought, that his eyes would be opened at the resurrection of the just, performed the duties of a laborious parish minister, in a new settlement, and also of a teacher of youth. Another individual, who was the pastor of an English church, a preacher to several native congregations, and the creator of an Indian language, did not lack time to pursue his Hebrew studies.

But it is not my intention to dwell on these interesting facts in the early records of New England. Before proceeding to the main purpose of this Address, I wish to fortify

myself with good examples, and to show that ancient precedents are in my favor.

I shall attempt, in the ensuing remarks, to adduce some reasons why the study of the Hebrew language should be made a part of a liberal education, and be put into the same category with Latin and Greek. There is no adequate cause for confining the study to a small part of one of the professions. Why should it not be considered as the common privilege of all the professions? I know of but one argument against its introduction into our present courses of collegiate study; — they are already preoccupied and crowded with other branches of learning. Were one or two additional years, however, allowed to the preparatory schools; were the elements of Latin and Greek thoroughly mastered at our academies, as they ought to be, and as they are at two or three of them, — an opening might be found somewhere in the four college years for the histories of Moses and for the songs of David. No considerate man would dislodge the Latin and Greek classics from the place which they now occupy. Still, Isaiah is in all respects, in simplicity, in fire, in originality, in sublimity, as worthy of study as Homer. The Lamentations of Jeremiah will not yield to the Elegies of Tyrtæus. These things ought to be done, while the other should not be left undone.

I. An argument for the study of Hebrew may be derived from the fact, that great eminence in the pursuit, on the part of a few individuals, cannot be expected in the absence of a general cultivation of the language.

It has been argued, that we need a few men, well skilled in the original Scriptures, to serve as defenders of the faith when attacked on critical grounds, while the great body of

the clergy and of the educated laity may safely neglect, or but imperfectly acquire, the branch of knowledge in question. That this general position is untenable, it were perfectly easy to demonstrate. Of the ten or twelve thousand ministers of Christ in the United States, more than ten, or fifty, or one hundred, or one thousand, ought to be intimately conversant with the original documents of their faith. Allowing, however, that a few men, well trained as original investigators, would meet the exigency, still we contend, that this small number could not be raised up amidst a surrounding ignorance, or a general apathy, in relation to the pursuit. No one acquainted with the history of the world, or with the nature of man, can entertain anexpectation so fallacious.

Why is England destitute, and why has she always been destitute, of great masters in music? Because her people have no taste for it. It is not taught in her schools. There is no chord running through her bustling population, which a mighty minstrel, rising up, could touch. It is the flight of the shuttle, and the stroke of the hammer, for which England has ears, — none for the charming symphony that wakens raptures high. Why has Germany produced Handel, Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, Weber, and nearly all the other distinguished original composers of music? Because these men could be understood and relished all over Germany. Every peasant is a singer; every family is an orchestra. Her entire population is impregnated with the spirit of song. It is considered to be no more difficult nor remarkable to read and write music in the schools, than it is to read and write language. This universal diffusion of the musical taste does not cramp genius, or prevent the rise of great men; on the contrary, it enlivens

genius, and creates masters who become the teachers of Christendom *

Why has France been eminent above other nations for mathematical development, so that we can hardly count up her Clairauts, Lalandes, Laplaces, Lagranges, Biots, Aragos? Because mathematics have been highly honored by sovereign and by people, not merely in the practical applications, but in the most abstract analyses. Her scientific men have not risen up alone, like a single cedar on the sides of Lebanon. Multitudes of young men, educated in her schools and sent forth in her armies, have been eminent mathematicians.

Sacred literature holds out like examples. England, in the seventeenth century, had a constellation of profound linguists. Learned travellers were despatched to the East; manuscripts and books were collected; Oriental professorships were founded; archbishops laid out their revenues in buying coins. Cromwell, "who chose men for places and not places for men," opened his republican chest. Translations, collations, and gigantic polyglots were the result. While the general interest continued, eminent scholars were not wanting.

Thus it is in Germany. Her Biblical scholars, who are

* "I always loved music; whoso hath skill in this art, the same is of good kind, fitted for all things; we must of necessity maintain music in schools; a schoolmaster ought to have skill in music; otherwise, I would not regard him, neither should we ordain young fellows to the office of preaching, except they have been before well exercised and practised in the school of music. Music is a fair gift of God, and near allied to divinity. I would not for a great matter be destitute of the small skill in music which I have. The youth ought to be brought up and accustomed to this art, for it maketh fine and expert people." — *Luther's Table Talk*, London, 1652, p. 500.

known the world over, did not rise up isolated without sympathy or encouragement. All the Middle and most of the North of Europe were spectators or competitors. Hosts of ardent scholars were pressing on behind them. They were borne upward by an impulse which they could not resist. Outward things combined with the inward resolution, and contributed materially to the result.

It is not denied, that there are apparent exceptions to this position. It has been strenuously argued, that a state of semi-barbarism is the most favorable for eminence in some of the fine arts, particularly in poetry. David, it has been said, reached by one bound the highest place in lyric composition. Homer flourished when the Greeks lived in caves, and fed on acorns. Yet these are not to be viewed altogether as exceptions. The people who had in their remembrance such strains as the sister of Moses sung at the Red Sea, such words as Moses himself delivered on the plains of Moab, such triumphal songs as that of Deborah, by the brook Kishon, could not but furnish many minds kindred to that of David. And it is not certain but that Homer has collected the spoils of a thousand preceding or contemporary bards, whose names have faded away, partly in the accidents of time, and not merely through his own transcendent effulgence.

In every department of labor, men are made for each other. They need the cheering sympathy and the generous coöperation of fellow-laborers. Were there none to share the pleasures of success, one half of its value would be wanting. A modest man does not wish to acquire languages, that he may be stared at as the eighth wonder of the world. Ordinarily he will have no heart to labor, unless he is surrounded by a community who can properly

estimate his productions. What motive has he to push his researches far beyond the point where they would be generally appreciated? What security, moreover, has the Church, that he will not involve himself with them in errors and absurdities? He needs around him the safeguard of a vigilant, as well as the support of a sympathizing community.

II. My second argument for the more general study of the Hebrew is, that we may be better prepared to take all proper advantage of the immense stores of erudition on the general subject, which have been collected in Germany.

Nothing is more common, and nothing is more unfounded, than national prejudice. The name of a Frenchman, with some persons, is a synonyme for the want of all sound and sober learning. With others, the common sense and the practical talent of the Englishman are worth all the world besides. Not a few extol Germany as the great centre of civilization, while her neighbors are groping in twilight. On the other hand, multitudes can see nothing there but cloudy metaphysics and learned atheism. But the truth is not contained in these omnivorous generalizations. The spirit of the Gospel requires us to judge of nations with the same candor and generous discrimination, which we should exercise towards individual men. A liberal education fails in one of its most precious fruits, if it does not lead the scholar to estimate every part of the earth in some such manner as we might suppose a pure-minded inhabitant of another world does. God has set one nation over against another, as he has the organs of the human body, that there might be mutual dependence and coöperation. His national gifts are not to be idolatrously magnified, nor to be sullenly set at naught. France needs the English steadi-

ness and the English wisdom. England might condescend to look over the Channel for mathematical and medical science. In the fields of literature, the Germans are unsurpassed. As intellectual explorers, they rise up by thousands. They have hardiness of body, iron resolution, patience, a sustaining enthusiasm, a spirit of vigorous competition, a high hereditary character to be maintained, and a learned and munificent government. In the department of sacred philology, their researches have been extensive and profound, and the results abundant. The Hebrew and its cognate dialects they have subjected to searching and discriminating examinations. Grammars and lexicons, introductions, commentaries, geographical treatises, elaborate essays on particular topics, and an almost infinite number of miscellaneous compositions, attest their wonderful diligence. But these immense treasures, in order fully to meet the wants of our community, require selection and arrangement; not simply a transfusion into our language, but an adaptation to our modes of thinking, to our taste and methods in illustration, to our theological tendencies, and to our general spirit. For many of their peculiarities as a theorizing and unpractical race, the Germans are not in fault. Not a few of the channels of activity are closed up against them by their government, which may be called a good, paternal despotism. In numerous cases, the productions of the German press demand emendation, and purification, if not an entire remodelling. We are not called upon to augment the stores of English infidelity. The products of the neological school may be left, as a general thing, to perish on the ground which gave them birth. The writings of some of the principal Evangelical theologians of Germany have not, by any means, all the value which

their ardent admirers attributed to them on their first introduction to our community. Schleiermacher, whose life is regarded as an era in Germany, seemed to have been long struggling to attain what he might have found by opening the pages of our Dr. Bellamy. The notions which are generally entertained on the continent of Europe in respect to the observance of the Sabbath, we should not wish to have transplanted here.

With these exceptions, however, the Germans possess mines of inestimable wealth, which ought to be opened for the benefit of the world. They are now, comparatively, unworked or unknown. The social and political circumstances of the German States are such as not to admit of the employment and diffusion of their stores of learning in a thousand ways accessible to those who speak the English tongue. A large part, however, of their Biblical labors are unappreciable by us. To use a favorite term of theirs, we have not reached the point of development. We are not able to grapple with their learning, nor sympathize with their spirit. Innumerable treatises, bearing on important points in the interpretation of the Old Testament, remain solitary copies in two or three of our libraries, because English versions of them could not be sold. Some of these essays would be of essential aid to all those foreign missionaries, who are called to the office of translating the Scriptures.

Moreover, it seems to be the especial duty of the scholars of this country to give to the treatises in question currency in the English tongue. The few individuals in Great Britain, who have the ability and the inclination to engage in these pursuits, are almost wholly withdrawn to the vindication of their political and ecclesiastical rights. Few results,

comparatively, can be expected in that country, till the civil storms are blown over, or till the exclusive regard to what is immediately practical shall give place to juster views.

III. The importance of the study of the Hebrew language may be argued from its effect in strengthening the faith of the student in the genuineness and divine authority of the Scriptures.

The Roman Catholic binds up certain apocryphal books with the Old Testament. But it should seem hardly possible for a reader of common discernment not to perceive instantly, that the claims of these books to inspiration rest on a very precarious basis. To render this obvious, they need only to be read in connection with the canonical books. These latter have the unstudied guilelessness, the transparency, the uniform dignity of divine truth; the former may have traces of proceeding from honest and pious minds, but the dignity is not sustained; the simplicity is an imitation; they contain, not unfrequently, jejune repetitions and puerilities. Their inferiority is rendered more striking by their position. Tobit would be a respectable story if it were not crowded in between Malachi and Matthew. But placed where it is, it is brought into most unfortunate proximity with the writings whose purity, decorum, and consistency indicate their higher origin. Thus our confidence in the divinity of God's word is materially strengthened. It arises in part from feeling. We cannot describe the process. Before we are aware, the perception of the difference between the two classes of writing has become a part of our consciousness.

But if such is the effect in comparing the apocryphal books with our excellent English version of the Old Testament, the contrast is much heightened by examining the

former in connection with the original of the latter. The Hebrew has the signatures of a simplicity and a freshness, which no translation can fully copy, unless it be itself inspired. It is the freshness of Eden on the seventh morning of the creation; it is the simplicity of patriarchs and prophets; it is the innocent guilelessness of angels. Our translation is faithful to the sense of the original, and it will be an everlasting monument of the powers of the English language, especially in its Anglo-Saxon features. But it is no disparagement to the version to assert, that it does not give us all the vitality and beauty of the original. In reading the latter, we cannot but feel that we have passed into the holy of holies; the proofs of divinity are thick around us. We do not simply *know* that our faith in these records is firm, we *feel* that it is.

We may arrive at the same conclusion in another way. The translator must, in many cases, select *one* word, the best which he can find, to express the sense of the original word. He cannot employ amplification, paraphrase, circumlocution. He must take a single substantive, or a single epithet; else he weakens, or obscures, the passage. He very properly renders the verb דָּבַר by its fifth signification, *to speak*. He cannot even allude to the other, and more primary meanings, — *to arrange*, *to guide*, *to follow*, and *to lie in wait*. He rightly translates the noun דֶּרֶךְ by *path* or *road*, without even hinting that it has also the meaning of *the act of going*, *journey*, *mode of living*, *conduct towards God and man*, *religion*, *destiny or the way in which it goes with any one*. Thus with many other terms which might be mentioned. The sight of the original word will suggest to the reader, not simply the substantial signification of it in the passage, but all the related significations, near or

remote. At a single glance, he has the history of the word, not to confuse his conceptions, but to enlarge them and render them more vivid. A single word in the translation expresses the idea of the original substantially. But to unfold the sense in the various shades of it, in the utmost perfection, the etymology of the word is, perhaps, required, for the signification is partly contained in some other ramification from the root. Thus there will be a *vivid* apprehension of the passage. The characters of the revelation will stand out in bolder relief. The student will feel that he is no longer dealing with shadows; what he especially needs he will gain, — not faith in its lower forms, but a living and enduring impression of the great realities which are couched beneath the terms which are daily coming under his eye.

He will, also, attain to a more intelligent conviction of the truth of some particular facts or doctrines. We may select, for instance, that of the original unity of the human race. It seems now to be fully proved, that one speech, substantially so called, pervaded a considerable portion of Europe and Asia, and united in a bond of union nations professing the most irreconcilable religions, with the most dissimilar institutions, and bearing but a slight resemblance in physiognomy and color. This language, or family of languages, is the Indo-Germanic, or Indo-European. By further researches, it appears to be established, that this family is connected with the Semitic, of which the Hebrew is a dialect, not by a few verbal coincidences, but linked together, both by points of actual contact, and by the interposition of the Coptic, grounded on the essential structure and most necessary forms of the three.* In the common

* Dr. Wiseman's Lectures, p. 66.

Hebrew Lexicon now used in this Institution, whole families of biliteral roots are illustrated by analogies from the Indo-Germanic tongues, proving that the Hebrew in its primary elements approaches much nearer both to the European and the Southern Asiatic languages, than has been generally supposed. Every investigation in this field, and it is one of boundless extent and but just opened, increases the credibility of the Mosaic history of the creation of man, and helps to confute a standing cavil of infidelity, arising from the existing diversities in the language, color, and physical organization of our race. The diligent student of the original Scriptures will be constantly meeting with unexpected and interesting discoveries, which will afford him a satisfaction akin to that felt on the solving of some long-studied mathematical problem.

We have not space to illustrate the local evidence furnished by the Hebrew language, in the successive stages of its history, for the honesty of the sacred historians. When the Israelites were in Egypt, Egyptian words were incorporated with the language. There was a strong infusion of Chaldeeisms, when the people were in Babylon. Some of the later books contain words of Persian origin. Thus the language is a standing memorial of the general truth of the history.

But we hasten to consider, —

IV. The influence of the study of the Hebrew Scriptures on the imagination and the taste.

The imagination is not a modification of memory, or of any other mental faculty. It is an original quality of the mind. It has the power of conferring additional properties upon an object, or of abstracting from it some of those which it actually possesses, and of thus enabling the object

to react, like a new substance, upon the mind which has performed the process. It has also the power of shaping and of creating by innumerable methods. It consolidates numbers into unity and separates unity into numbers.* "It draws all things to one, — makes things animate and inanimate, beings with their attributes, subjects and their accessories, take one color, and serve to one effect." † In its highest or creative power, the imagination belongs only to the few great poets. But the faculty is, doubtless, possessed by all men, though in some cases it is faintly, or not at all, developed. Whoever can read with intelligence and sympathy a genuine poet, has imagination.

"The grand storehouses of enthusiastic and meditative imagination, as distinguished from human and dramatic imagination," remarks a great living writer, "are the prophetic and lyrical parts of the Holy Scriptures, and the works of Milton, to which I cannot forbear to add those of Spenser. I select these writers in preference to those of Greece and Rome, because the anthropomorphitism of the pagan religion subjected the minds of the greatest poets in those countries too much to the bondage of form, from which the Hebrews were preserved by their abhorrence of idolatry. This abhorrence was almost as strong in our great epic poet, both from the circumstances of his life, and from the constitution of his mind. However imbued the surface might be with classical literature, he was a Hebrew in soul, and all things in him tended towards the sublime."

The poetry of the Hebrews is sometimes represented as

* See these ideas beautifully expanded and illustrated in the Prefaces to Wordsworth's Poems, Boston edition, 1824.

† Charles Lamb on the Genius and Character of Hogarth, Works, Vol. II. p. 391, New York edition.

Oriental, an Eastern fashion, local, factitious, artificial, adapted to men living a migratory life, under an ardent sky, and not adapted to a severe European taste. But the Hebrew poetry is no such thing. It is European; it is Occidental, for all ages and generations; it is universal in its character; it is everlasting as the affections of man. It furnishes food for that imagination, whose birth was not for time, but for all eternity. Peasants can feel its force; philosophers kindle at its inspiration. Strip the Old Testament of its poetry, and it is not the Old Testament; it contains truth, but not the truth which God revealed. Take out of it the element of imagination, that which makes it poetry, and the residue is neither poetry nor prose. It may be truth, but it is not the truth which we need. No error can be greater than to call the Hebrew poetry mere costume. There are some truths which are poetry in their very nature. Men, the world over, have imagination, and love poetic truths, and these truths were necessary for them, and therefore part of the Bible is poetry.

The Arab praises the Koran because it contains lofty, poetic conceptions of the Deity; but these are the very things which Mohammed stole from the Jewish Scriptures.

It has been, sometimes, a matter of wonder how the poet Dante, rising up when the human mind was at its nadir, alone, in the night of the dark ages, in Italy, in the confluence, as it were, of the two streams of corruption and death, in the midst of petty disputes, raging civil discords, when men were burnt to death for astrology, — how he could pour forth numbers so sublime, and at once take a position higher than that attained, with two or three exceptions, by uninspired poets.* But the answer is, that Dante

* North American Review, Oct. 1833.

had read Moses's description of Eden and of the fall. His imagination had been fed with the visions of Ezekiel and of the Apocalypse.

The highest, the grand characteristic of Hebrew poetry is, that it furnishes the *germs* of innumerable thoughts, hints, obscure intimations, recondite allusions, almost hidden gleams of imagination, out of which a great poet will erect an ode or an epic. Isaiah had said that "Lucifer sat upon the mount of the congregation on the sides of the north." This was enough for Milton. From this scarcely intelligible hint, the poet threw up a palace for his fallen angel, thus: —

> "At length into the limits of the north
> They came, and Satan to his royal seat,
> High on a hill, far blazing, as a mount
> Raised on a mount, with pyramids and towers,
> From diamond quarries hewn, and rocks of gold.
> The palace of great Lucifer, so call
> That structure in the dialect of men
> Interpreted; which not long after he,
> Affecting all equality with God,
> In imitation of that mount whereon
> Messiah was declared in sight of Heaven,
> The mountain of the congregation called," etc.*

It is these almost concealed gleams of imagination, where a common eye would see nothing, and a common imagination would remain unaffected, — seeds of the loftiest thoughts, germs of the highest poetry, — which the Bible contains more than all other books, that has fixed the eye, and kindled the conceptions, of the great masters of the pencil. How many sublime paintings have been suggested

* Mitford's Life of Milton, I. p. 73.

by the Apocalypse, itself essentially a piece of Hebrew poetry!

Besides, much of the Hebrew poetry is addressed to the imagination in its most poetic, in its creative sense. It supplies something other than hints. It has regular and sustained pieces of composition, in which imagination is the predominant element, just as it is in the first two books of Paradise Lost. Such are the thirteenth and fourteenth chapters of Isaiah, the introductory vision of Ezekiel, and the entire book of Nahum. The capricious, the fanciful, the temporary, are excluded. The metaphors are indefinite in extent, yet true to nature. They are not to be judged by the rigor of logic or of mathematics; but they have a science of their own, from whose rules they never deviate. The reader who is not aware of this prevailing element in these compositions, and who cannot bring some portion of the same element to their illustration, will not see all their beauty, nor feel all their force.

Unaffected pathos is another characteristic of Hebrew poetry.

It is a singular fact, that, among the almost innumerable commentaries which Germany has poured forth on the various books of the Old Testament, the writings of Jeremiah have been generally passed by. We hardly know of a good critical commentary on it in any language. Isaiah receives all the commendation, sometimes at the expense of great literary injustice to Jeremiah.* But for true, poetic sensibility, Jeremiah is unsurpassed. A tender and plaintive melancholy, untinged by the least bitterness or misanthropy, is diffused through his writings. In the midst

* See Gesenius's Commentary on Isaiah, in many places.

of an earnest remonstrance, or an historical narrative, we unexpectedly meet with a stroke of pathos, which, it would seem, he could not restrain till he had completed the composition. Coming upon us as it does, while we are listening to the recital of the idolatries and horrible cruelties of his ungrateful countrymen, it is like the tones of a human voice to a solitary traveller on a sandy and savage desert. The Lamentations are an exhibition of patriotism, confidence in God, artless and overwhelming grief, bold apostrophe, delicate personal allusions, and generous enthusiasm, which has no parallel. It is not Brutus at Philippi, nor Marius on the ruins of Carthage ; but it is a venerable prophet of the Lord treading on the ashes of the holy city and on the bones of the daughters of Zion.

In offering these remarks on the universal and imperishable character of Hebrew poetry, we do not intend to deny, that there are Orientalisms, an Eastern costume, modes of speaking and figures of speech which are peculiar to the East. The images of the Orientals are bolder and more fiery than ours. We are accustomed to compare man to the various objects of nature ; they liken external objects to man, and make all nature instinct with life. With them science is the mother of virtue ; precipitation is the mother of repentance ; the soldier is the son of war ; the traveller is the son of the road ; words are the daughters of the lips ; and prudence is the daughter of reflection. Every thing, even down to a letter of introduction, or to the firman of the Sultan, must be in a poetic form.

In the consideration of these subordinate matters, the Western student must exercise his taste, or that acquired power which judges of the fitness or congruity of objects. As a reader or interpreter of the Old Testament original, he

will have full scope for the exercise both of his imagination and his taste. No ampler or richer field for their development or cultivation could be desired.

Such cultivation and development, moreover, are needed by the youthful Evangelical clergymen of our country. In their anxiety to become sound theologians, or skilful logicians, or in the pressure of practical duties, they have too much neglected the province of imagination and taste. In this respect the two denominations more particularly connected with this Institution are, unquestionably, inferior to some other denominations of Christians. Consequently, in not a few excellent men, there has been an inability to appreciate and employ all the treasures which are accumulated in God's word. They have not availed themselves of that cultivation of the taste and of the imagination, which may be acquired by faithfully studying such compositions as those of David and of Isaiah. There exists, in our community, a class of highly disciplined minds that Evangelical clergymen have not in general been able to reach. Intellect has not been wanting, nor theology, nor piety; but there has been a deficiency in those graces of style, and in that highly cultivated taste, which are required to meet the exigencies of the higher circles in society. No man of sense would argue for what are sometimes called tasteful or imaginative preachers. Yet, as the powers of imagination are one of the noblest gifts of God, as their exercise is entirely consistent with a sober judgment and with sound common sense, and as a leading class in the community will not be affected by the truths of the Gospel, unless they are presented in acceptable words and enforced in good taste, we are certainly under the highest obligations to develop these powers of imagination and of taste, and employ them fully in the service of our Lord.

V. Another important consideration is the bearing of the study of Hebrew upon the missionary enterprise.

The one hundred and twenty-two ordained missionaries sent out by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, sixty-nine of whom were educated at this Institution, have published, with the aid of their assistants, between fifty and sixty millions of pages, a large proportion of which are parts of the Scriptures. The number of languages employed is twenty-nine, nine of which were first reduced to writing by these missionaries. In all this wide department of labor, augmenting every year, an accurate acquaintance with the original Hebrew is of course indispensable. The missionary translator is not to repair to the Vulgate, nor to the Septuagint, but to the fountain-head.

In the labors which are to be entered into for the conversion of the five or six millions of Jews, scattered over the world, the necessity of the Hebrew Bible is too obvious to need the briefest allusion. In respect to familiarity with its pages, the missionary himself must become a Jew.

The bearings of the subject upon those who speak the Arabic tongue may justify a moment's consideration. The great problem for the friends of civilization and Christianity to solve, is the conversion of the millions who use the Chinese and the Arabic languages. These enlightened and saved, the world, comparatively, is evangelized. Henry Martyn, in speaking of the Arabic translation of the Bible, says: "It will be of more importance than one fourth of all that have ever been made. We can begin to preach to Arabia, Syria, Persia, Tartary, part of India and China, half of Africa, and nearly all the sea-coasts of the Mediterranean, including Turkey." According to the tables in the

Modern Atlas, this would give upwards of two hundred millions, who would be reached through the Arabic tongue. This calculation may, perhaps, appear extravagant; yet, if we look at the extent of the language, with all its different dialects, the number who use it will fall not far short of one fourth of the population of the globe.* Any thing, therefore, which will materially aid us in the acquisition of the Arabic has a value which words cannot express.

What, then, are the relations between the Hebrew and the Arabic? Most intimate and fundamental. The Arabs have a common ancestry with the Jews, partly from Abraham through Ishmael, and partly from Heber through his son Joktan. Some of the Arab tribes most clearly spoke the same language with the Israelites, while Moses was leading the latter through the wilderness. At what time there was a divergence, we are not informed. But in nu-

* The *written* Arabic, or that in which the Koran is composed, was the language of the people inhabiting the vast empire founded by the successors of Mohammed. It is now the religious and literary language of the numerous nations that profess Islamism, extending from the island of Goree in the Atlantic Ocean to the eastern extremity of Africa, and from Madagascar to the rivers Oby and Volga in the North of Asia and Europe. The *vulgar* Arabic is spoken in a great part of Syria, in Mesopotamia, in Khusistan and Fars along the Persian Gulf, on the Coromandel and Malabar coasts in India, in all Egypt, in Nubia, along the whole course of the Nile from Egypt to Sennaar, by the Arabs and Moors in all the towns of the Barbary States, and by the wandering Bedouins, in a part of Biledulgerid, in Fezzan, in Sahara, in part of the kingdoms of Kordofan, Darfour, and of Bornou Proper, in different states on the coast of Zanguebar, in Socotra, in a great part of Madagascar, in Malta, and in some of the islands of the Indian archipelago. There are various dialects of the vulgar Arabic, but they do not differ greatly from one another. See Balbi's *Atlas Ethnographique du Globe*, Paris, 1826.

merous and in important points, the two languages yet remain identical.

The affinity of languages is sought by one class of philologists in their *words;* in their *grammar*, by another class. According to the former, words are the matter of language, and grammar its form or fashioning; according to the latter, grammar is an essential, inborn element of a language, so that a new grammar cannot be separately imposed upon a people. But whichever of these methods is adopted, in order to determine the affinity of two languages, the result in the case before us is the same. The Hebrew and Arabic are kindred both in words and in grammar, both lexically and grammatically. In an Arabic translation of the Pentateuch, about one half of the words are Hebrew, with the same radical letters. One writer enumerates more than three hundred names of the most common objects in nature which are the same in both, without by any means exhausting the list. The roots in both languages are generally dissyllabic, lying in the verb rather than in the noun. The two languages abound in guttural sounds. The oblique cases of pronouns are appended to the verb, the noun, and to particles. The verb has but two tenses. The gender is only twofold. The cases are designated by means of prepositions. The genitive is expressed by a change in the first noun, not in the second. The noun and the verb do not admit of being compounded. There is a certain simplicity in the syntax, and the diction is, in the highest degree, unperiodic. In the Hebrew Lexicon which we here daily use, almost every Hebrew root has a corresponding Arabic one, with the same radicals, and generally with the same signification.

In promoting, therefore, the study of Hebrew in this

country, we are taking a most direct means to spread the glorious Gospel of Christ, not only where the Arabic is the dominant language, but wherever Islamism has penetrated; that is, from Calcutta to Constantinople, and from the Caspian Sea to our American colony in Liberia. A thorough knowledge of Hebrew will remove at least one half the difficulty of acquiring the Arabic. It will introduce us to the same modes of writing and of thought, to the same poetic diction, and in part to the same material objects, the same countries, and the same historical associations. In this sense, the Hebrew is not a *dead* language. By its most intimate connection with the Arabic, and, I may add, with the Syriac, it is still spoken at the foot of Mount Ararat, on the site of old Nineveh, at Carthage, in the ancient Berytus, and where Paul was shipwrecked. It is reviving in Egypt, and the Bible and the Tract Societies are spreading its literature on the wings of every wind.

There are two other points upon which, did the time admit, some remarks might be offered, namely, the light which a critical examination of the Hebrew Scriptures might be expected to throw on the systems of Christian theology; and on the present increasing tendency in some portions of the Church to undervalue the Old Testament, and to degrade it from any connection with the New, thus in effect subverting the authority of both. But I forbear.

It is with unfeigned diffidence, and not without fear and trembling, that I enter upon the duties before me. My associations in this place are those of a learner in the presence of venerated teachers, both among the living and the dead. The course of study is, indeed, delightful, and fond

and ardent hopes might be indulged by one just entering upon it; yet the experience of almost every day warns us that the fairest earthly hopes bloom only for the grave. The work, too, is one where presumption and ignorance have no place, — interpreting the thoughts of Heaven, — endeavoring to explain the mind of the Holy Spirit. Yet that Spirit, humbly sought, giveth power to the faint, and to them that have no might increaseth strength.

EARLY ENGLISH VERSIONS OF THE BIBLE.*

Of the early history of the Christian Church in Britain, our information is very imperfect. In whatever manner Christianity was introduced into the island, whether by Paul or by some other missionary, it is altogether probable that the sacred writings were soon communicated to the new converts. Eusebius affirms, that both Greeks and barbarians had the writings concerning Jesus in their own country characters and language.† In an extraordinary consistory, held at Rome, A. D. 679, respecting British affairs, it was, among other things, ordained, that lessons out of the divine oracles should be always read for the edification of the churches. About the middle of the sixth century, in 563 or 565, Columba founded the monastery on the island of Y-Kolmkill, best known under the name of Iona. In regard to the occupants of that celebrated seat of learn-

* This Essay was published in the Biblical Repository, October, 1835. Some alterations made in it by the author himself appear in this edition. He had intended to make other changes in it before its republication.

† "Jam ante ortas eorum qui hodie protestantes appellantur novitates, apud omnes fere Christiani nominis gentes Scripturae versiones extitisse lingua vernacula multas probare non esset arduum." — *F. Simon, Disq. Crit. de variis Bibl. Edit.*

ing, the venerable Bede says: "Tantum ea quae in propheticis, evangelicis, et apostolicis literis discere poterant pietatis et castitatis opera diligenter observantes."* Respecting one of the bishops, Aidan, he remarks: "In tantum autem vita illius à nostri temporis segitiâ distabat; ut omnes qui cum eo incedebant, sive adtonsi, sive laici, meditari deberent, id est, aut legendis Scripturis, aut Psalmis discendis operam dare. Hoc erat quotidianum opus illius, et omnium, qui cum eo erant fratrum ubicunque locorum devenissent."† In the sermon of Chrysostom concerning the utility of reading the Scriptures, we find the following: "Though thou visitest the ocean and these British islands, though thou sailest to the Euxine Sea, and travellest to the southern regions, thou shalt hear *all* men, everywhere, reasoning out of the Scripture, with another voice indeed, but not with another faith; with a different tongue, but with an according mind."‡ Bede says further respecting Britain in his own time, that "in the language of five nations, it searched out and acknowledged one and the same acquaintance with the highest truth, and with real sublimity; to wit, of the English, the Britons, the Scots, the Picts, and the Latins." The evidence, if not decisive, is at least strong, in favor of the existence of British translations of the Bible, or parts of the Bible. Instances are given in

* Bede, Tom. III. Basle ed. 1563, Lib. III. Hist. Eccles. Ch. IV. p. 74.

† Id. Ch. V. p. 75.

‡ Κἂν εἰς τὸν ὠκεανὸν ἀπέλθῃς, κἂν πρὸς τὰς Βρεταννικὰς νήσους ἐκείνας· κἂν εἰς τὸν Εὔξινον πλεύσῃς πόντον, κἂν πρὸς τὰ νότια ἀπέλθῃς μέρη· πάντων ἀκούσῃ πανταχοῦ τὰ ἀπὸ τῆς γραφῆς φιλοσοφούντων, φωνῇ μὲν ἑτέρᾳ καὶ γλώσσῃ μὲν διὰ φόρῳ, διανοία δὲ συμφώνῳ.

Bede of children and youth who had a familiar knowledge of the Scriptures.

About the year 449, the Saxons were invited into England. They gradually increased in power, and founded one kingdom after another, till the full establishment of the octarchy, about 586. The Britons, for the most part, took refuge in Wales, Cornwall, Bretagne, France, and other countries. The Saxon conquest was so complete, that they spread their own language exclusively in the parts which they occupied. On every district or place where they came, they imposed their own names, generally denoting the nature, situation, or some striking feature of the places to which they were given. A succession of Saxon kings reigned in the island for four hundred and thirty years, till about the year 1016; when Canute, a Dane, ascended the English throne. In a little more than twenty years the Saxon line was restored, and continued till the Norman Conquest in 1066.* The Anglo-Saxons removed to England from the southern parts of Schleswig, and neighboring parts of Germany. They consisted of three distinct Gothic races, — Saxons, Angles, and Jutes. Whether the Angles or the Saxons were the more numerous, is not known with certainty; but the Angles finally conquered a large portion of the country, and gave their name to the whole nation. The Jutes were the fewest in number. The Anglo-Saxon tongue appears to have been in its origin a rude mixture of the dialects of the Saxons, the Angles, and the Jutes; but we are not acquainted with it in that state, these dialects having soon coalesced into one language, as the various kindred tribes soon united to form one nation, after they

* Turner's History of the Anglo-Saxons, Vol. III. p. 1.

had taken possession of England. With the introduction of Christianity and the Roman alphabet, their literature began. Even under the Danish kings, all laws and edicts were promulgated in pure Anglo-Saxon. King Ethelbert adopted Christianity about 593 or 596, and his laws, which we may refer to about the year 600, are, perhaps, the oldest extant in Anglo-Saxon.*

Strype, in his Life of Archbishop Parker,† gives the following account of some Saxon manuscripts and versions of parts of the Bible. In the library of the University of Cambridge is Jerome's Latin Psalter in vellum, with the Saxon interlinear version.‡ The Latin is in black letter, the Saxon in red, and the titles in green. There are, besides, sacred hymns, as those of Isaiah, Anna, and Moses, the Three Children, the Magnificat, etc., in Latin and Saxon. Another book in vellum, written about the time of the Conquest, contains the four Gospels in Saxon, with rubrics. A third volume in vellum, also in the Cambridge library, in large octavo, contains a collection of Saxon homilies. In the library of Trinity College is another book of Saxon homilies in parchment, written a little before the Conquest. Archbishop Parker, in his Preface to a new translation of the Bible, says: "Our old forefathers, who ruled in this realm in their times, and in diverse ages, did their diligence to translate whole books of the Scriptures to the erudition of the laity; as yet to this day are to be seen divers books translated into the vulgar tongue, some by kings of the

* Rask's Anglo-Saxon Grammar, Preface, p. 47.

† Ed. of 1611, fol., p. 532.

‡ According to Baber, this Psalter has well-grounded pretensions of being one of the books which Pope Gregory the Great sent to Augustin, soon after his arrival in England.

realm, some by bishops, some by abbots, some by other devout godly fathers. So desirous were they of old time to have the lay-sort edified in godliness, by reading in their vulgar tongue, that very many books be yet extant, though for the age of the speech, and strangeness of the character of many of them, almost worn out of knowledge. In which books may be seen, evidently, how it was used among the *Saxons*, to have in their churches read the four Gospels, so distributed and picked out in the body of the Evangelists' books, that to every Sunday and festival-day in the year, they were sorted out to the common ministers of the Church in their common prayers, to be read to their people."

We are informed by Baber, that some of the most remarkable portions of sacred history appeared in the seventh century, in a paraphrastic, poetical version, made by Caedmon, a monk, whose piety led him to cultivate religious poetry. This earliest specimen of Saxon poetry was published by Junius, at Amsterdam, in 1665. It abounds with periphrasis and metaphor. Literal translations of the sacred songs of the Bible, and of the lessons which the Church had selected for the daily service, were put forth in the eighth century. In the early part of the eighth century, Guthlac, the first Saxon anchoret, is reputed to have produced an Anglo-Saxon version of the Psalter.

Adelm, or Aldhelm, the first Bishop of Sherburne, translated the Psalter into Saxon, about the year 706. In his book De Virginitate, he praises the nuns to whom he wrote, for their great industry and towardliness in the daily reading of the Scriptures. Bede says that Aidan, a Scotch bishop, who diffused Christianity in Northumberland in the reign of Oswald, took care that all those who travelled with

him, whether clergy or laity, should spend a considerable part of their time in reading the Scriptures. Usher, in his Historia Dogmatica, Ch. V., says that Egbert (otherwise called Elfrid, Eadfrid, and Eckfrid), Bishop of Landisferne, made a Saxon translation of the four Evangelists, without distinction of chapters.* A few years after, the venerable

* Appendix to Strype, p. 132. Watson's Tracts, Vol. III. p. 62. — Baber says that Eadfrid did not translate any portions of the Bible. In honor of St. Cuthbert he, about A. D. 680, with great care and labor, transcribed the Gospels, in the Latin tongue, following the version of Jerome. An interlinear Saxon version was afterwards added by Aldred, a priest. Saxon scholars differ materially in their opinions of the age in which this Anglo-Saxon version was written. Mr. Henshall, who published Aldred's translation of Matthew, pronounces it to be a production of the eighth century. Mr. Ingram, late Saxon Professor at Oxford, supposes that it was made three hundred and sixty years after the Latin version which it accompanies. Humphrey Wanley, a sober critic, attributes it to the time of Alfred. The *Durham Book*, the name of this most venerable relic of antiquity, is in the British Museum, and is the finest specimen of Saxon calligraphy and decoration extant. In the Library of Bennet College, Cambridge, is a manuscript containing another Saxon version of the Gospels. Its author is unknown. It was written a little before the Conquest, and appears to be a transcript of an older manuscript. In the Bodleian Library is a manuscript of the same version, which bears evidence of having been written, at various times, by different persons. Matthew seems not to have been completed by one translator alone. Of the two last-named versions, one seems to have been a transcript of the other. The Bodleian manuscript belonged formerly to Archbishop Parker, under whose direction it was published, in 1571, by Fox, the martyrologist. The Gospels were printed in Saxon types, and are accompanied with an English version, taken out of the Bishops' Bible, and here and there altered to be accommodated to the Saxon. Being found to be inaccurately transcribed, and incorrectly printed, they were afterwards revised by Junius, in conjunction with Dr. Marshall, and were published together with the Mæso-Gothic fragments ascribed to Ulphilas. For this purpose, Ju-

Bede translated a part (perhaps only John's Gospel) of the Bible into Saxon. Asser relates that the last sentence of John was finished when he was expiring. Nearly two hundred years after Bede, King Alfred executed almost an entire translation of the Psalms, either to supply the loss of Adhelm's (which is supposed to have perished in the Danish wars), or to improve the plainness of Bede's version. A Saxon translation of the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, part of the books of Kings, Esther, Job, and the apocryphal books of Judith and the Maccabees, is also attributed to Elfric or Elfred, who was Archbishop of Canterbury, A. D. 995. This work of Elfric is by no means a complete version of the above-mentioned books. There are accurate verbal translations; but for the most part he has stated only in substance the precepts and the histories of the inspired penmen.

We now quote a few verses from the Anglo-Saxon Testament printed at Dort, in 1665, opera Fr. Junii et Th. Marschalii.

Luke xv. 11–19.† "He cwaéð sóðlice: Sum man

---

nius collected six manuscripts, the Oxford, the Cambridge, the Bennet, the Hatton, the Durham Book, and the Rushworth Gloss. Marshall has enriched the volume with many observations upon this version, and has particularly noticed those passages, which, at variance with the reading of the Vulgate, as its text now stands, agree with the Codex Bezæ. Hence it is a fair conclusion, that the Anglo-Saxon was translated from the Vetus Italica, or old Latin version, as it stood before it was corrected by Jerome.

† "As some of the Anglo-Saxon characters deviate a little in their form from the Latin, of which both they and the Gothic are a corruption, or, as it were, a peculiar sort of hand, which is also used by the Anglo-Saxons, even in the writing of Latin itself; I have not hesitated to adopt in their stead those now in general use, with two excep-

hacefde twégen suna; þá cwaéð se gyngra tó hys faeder: Faeder! syle me minne dáel þinre aehte, þe me tó-gebyreð; þá dáelde he him his aehte. ðá aefter feawa dagum ealle his þing gegadrude sé gingra sunu, and férde wraédice on feorlen ríce, and forspilde þar his aehta, byblende on his gaelsan. Þa he híg haefde ealle amyrrede, þá wearð mycel hunger on þám ríce, and he wearð waedla; þá férde he and folgude ánum buhr-sittendum men þaes ríces; þá sende he hyne tó hys túne, þaet heolde his swýn. Þá gewilnode he his wamba gefyllan of þám béan-coddum, þe ðá swýn áeton, and him man ne sealde; þá beðóte he hyne and cwáeð. Eálá hú fela hýrlinga on mínes faeder húse hláf genóhne habbað, and ic her on hungre forwurðe, ic aríse and ic fare tó minum faeder, and ic secge hym; eálá faeder! ic syngode on heofonas ánd beforan þe, nú ic neom wyrðe, þaet ic beó þin sunu genemned, dó me swá ánne of þínum hýrlingum."

In the year 1066, William of Normandy conquered England, but the highly cultivated, deep-rooted, ancient, national tongue could not be immediately extirpated, though it was instantly banished from the court. William's laws even were issued in French. A fragment of the Saxon Chronicle, published by Lye, concluding with the year 1079, is still in pretty correct Anglo-Saxon; but in the continuation of the same Chronicle, from 1135 to 1140, almost all the inflections of the language are either changed or neglected, as well as the orthography, and most of the old phrases and idioms. We may, therefore, fix the year 1100

tions." — *Rask*. These exceptions both answer to the English *th*, which has first a hard sound, as in *thing*, nearly resembling the ϑ of the Greeks, and, secondly, a softer sound, as in *this, thou, other*, like the modern Greek δ.

as the limit of the Anglo-Saxon tongue. The confusion which prevailed after 1100 belongs to the *Old English period.**

The Saxon tongue was at length so altered and corrupted, as to become nearly useless. The Bible being now in Latin only, and not very common in that language, the opinion began to gain ground, that the knowledge of the Scriptures was unnecessary, or rather that it was not lawful for private Christians to read them in their vernacular tongue. William Butler, a Franciscan friar, maintained that "the prelates ought not to admit of this, that every one should read at his pleasure the Scriptures translated into Latin." The priests knew nothing of the Scriptures but what they found in their missals and other forms of their worship. John Beleth, an eminent divine of Paris, observed that "the laudable custom had prevailed in some churches of explaining the Gospel to the people in the vulgar tongue, immediately after it had been pronounced in Latin. But what shall we say of our times, when there is scarce any one to be found who understands what he reads or hears?"

In the latter part of the thirteenth century, and in the beginning of the fourteenth, several attempts were made to translate into the English then spoken, the Psalter, the hymns of the Church, and parts of the Scriptures.

The earliest of these monuments, after the Saxon times, is a paraphrase of the Gospels and Acts of the Apostles, entitled "Ormulum," from the name of its author, Orme, or Ormin, written in imitation of Saxon poetry, without rhyme, but in the English language, in its very infancy. Next to this stands a curious volume of prodigious size, en-

* Rask's Anglo-Saxon Grammar, Preface, p. 47.

titled "Sowle-hele" (or Soul's Health), which has been referred to a period shortly anterior to the thirteenth century. It is beautifully written on vellum, and elegantly illuminated; and contains a metrical paraphrase of the Old and New Testaments. It seems to have been the object of the compiler to form a complete body of legendary and Scriptural history in verse, or rather to collect into one view all the religious poetry he could find. Apparently coeval with this, is another version of a similar description, comprising a large portion of Genesis and Exodus, but evidently the work of another hand, and composed in the Northern dialect of that age. In the same dialect is a rhymed version of the Psalms, which has been referred to the end of the thirteenth or the beginning of the fourteenth century. The following is the version of the hundredth psalm:

"Mirthes to God al erthe that es,
Serves to Loverd in fames,
In go yhe ai in his siht,
In gladnes that is so briht,
Whites that loverd god is he thus;
He us made, and our self noht us,
His folke and shep of his fode,
In gos his ghates that are gode;
In schrift, his worches belive,
In ympnes to him ye schrive,
Heryhes his name for loverde is hende,
In all his merci do in strende and strende."

Somewhat later lived Richard Rolle, a hermit of the Augustine order, who resided at Hampole near Doncaster. He died A. D. 1349. He translated the Psalter into English, and wrote a gloss upon it. The writer of a book, in 1470, called the "Looking-glass of the Blessed Virgin," says: "I have given but a few psalms translated into Eng-

lish, because you have them at hand of the version of Richard Hampole, or of that of the English Bible, if you have but leave to read them." Some have supposed Hampole's translation to be the same as that of Wiclif's, but without foundation. Before the prologue is the following sentence: "Here begynneth the prologe uppon the Sauter that Richard, hermyte of Hampole, translated into englyshe after the sentence of doctours and resoun." The second psalm runs thus: "Whi gnastide the folke? and the puple thoughte y dit thoughtis? The prophete snybbyng hem that shulde turmente crist seith, whi? as hoo seith, what enchesun hadde thei? Sotheli none but yuel wille," etc.

In the Harleian Library is a somewhat different translation of the Psalter, with a gloss upon it. In the king's library is a third imperfect copy of a translation of the Psalter from Psalm lxxxix. to cxviii. There is nothing in the manuscript to show the author. The eighty-ninth psalm begins thus: "Lord, thou are made refute to us fro generacioun to generacioun." At the end of the Hampole Psalter are various canticles and songs translated and commented upon. In the manuscript library of Bennet College, Cambridge, is a gloss, in the English spoken after the Conquest, on the following books of the New Testament: Mark, Luke, Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Thessalonians, Timothy, Titus, Philemon, and Hebrews. Between Colossians and Thessalonians is the apocryphal Epistle to the Laodiceans. Mark i. 7 is thus: "And he prechyde sayande, a stalworthier thane I shal come efter me of whom I ane not worthi downfallande, or knelande, to louse the thwonge of his chawcers"; vi. 22, "When the doughter of that Herodias was in comyn and had tombylde and pleside to Harowde, and also to the sit-

tande at mete, the kynge says to the wench." Towards the close of the fourteenth century, John de Trevisa, vicar of Berkeley, Gloucestershire, at the desire of his patron, Lord Berkeley, translated some passages of the Bible, which were painted on the walls of his patron's chapel at Berkeley Castle, or which are scattered in some parts of his works, several copies of which are known to exist in manuscript, and which seems to have given rise to the mistaken notion that he translated the whole Bible.

About six miles from the town of Richmond, in Yorkshire, is the small village of Wiclif, which, from the Conquest to the end of the sixteenth century, was the residence of a family of the same name. In this village, or in its immediate vicinity, there is good reason to believe that John Wiclif was born, about the year 1324. He was first admitted to Queen's College, Oxford, but soon removed to Merton College, an institution which supplied the Church with Thomas Bradwardine, the *profound doctor*, Walter Burley, the *perspicuous doctor*, William Occham, the *singular doctor* or venerable *inceptor*, and, finally, with Wiclif, who was called the *evangelic* or *Gospel doctor*. Wiclif is described by his bitterest enemy as "second to none in philosophy, and in scholastic discipline altogether incomparable." He also diligently studied the municipal, civil, and canon laws, and the primitive Christian writers. But his studies were nobly distinguished from those of his contemporaries by his ardent devotion to the Bible itself. This implied in him a strength of soul and an independence of purpose which it is difficult for us fully to appreciate. The compilations of Peter Lombard were in much higher and more general estimation than the Gospel of Jesus Christ. "The graduate, says Roger Bacon, "who reads, or lectures on the text of

Scripture, is compelled to give way to the reader of the Sentences, who everywhere enjoys honor and precedence. He who reads the Sentences has the choice of his hour and ample entertainment among the religious orders. He who reads the Bible is destitute of these advantages, and sues, like a mendicant, to the reader of the Sentences, for the use of such hour as it may please him to grant. He who reads the Sums of Divinity is everywhere allowed to hold disputations, and is venerated as master; he who only reads the text is not permitted to dispute at all; *which is absurd.*" The Scriptural teachers became objects of derision, and were termed the "bullocks of Abraham," and the "asses of Balaam."

In 1372, Wiclif received the degree of doctor in divinity, and was promoted to the theological chair of Oxford. He soon published an Exposition of the Decalogue, a plain Scriptural statement of the principles of the two tables. In another work of Wiclif's (one of the most copious and important of all his performances) on the "Truth and Meaning of Scripture," he contends for the supreme authority and entire sufficiency of the Scriptures, and for the necessity of translating them into English. About three hundred of the manuscript homilies of Wiclif are in the British Museum and elsewhere. They are rapid expositions of the Bible, called in the language of the day *postils.* The Holy Scriptures are represented throughout as the supreme authority.

"There was another weapon," says Dr. Lingard, the Romish historian, "which Wiclif wielded with equal address, and still greater efficiency. In proof of his doctrine he appealed to the Scriptures, and thus made his disciples judges between him and the bishops. Several versions of the sacred writings were even then extant; but they were

confined to libraries, or only in the hands of persons who aspired to superior sanctity. Wiclif made a new translation, multiplied the copies with the aid of transcribers, and by his *poor priests* recommended it to the perusal of their hearers. *In their hands it became an engine of wonderful power.* Men were flattered with an appeal to their private judgment; the new doctrines insensibly acquired partisans and protectors in the higher classes, who alone are acquainted with the use of letters; a spirit of inquiry was generated; and the seeds were sown of that religious revolution, which, in a little more than a century, astonished and convulsed the nations of Europe." There is one inaccuracy in the preceding quotation. There was not, as it should seem, any complete version of the English Bible in existence. The only circumstance, which can throw any shade of suspicion over Wiclif's claim to the honor of presenting England with the first complete version of the Old and New Testament, is the existence of a little work by the title of *Elucidarum Bibliorum*, or "Prologue to the Complete Version of the Bible." The Bodleian Library has a manuscript of this book, to which is annexed the date of MCCC . . . VIII. If this date be correct, it cuts off the claim of Wiclif. It is clear, however, that the interval between the two Roman numerals C and V was originally occupied by another numeral, of which there has been a manifest erasure; and if, as is most probable, that numeral was a C, the date of the manuscript, instead of 1308, will be 1408, a period later than the death of Wiclif, by twenty-four years. In the tenth chapter, moreover, the work appeals to the authority of Gerson, a distinguished divine of that age, by the name of Parisiensis; and as Gerson was not born till 1363, it is scarcely credible that he could have

been an author of celebrity till after the death of Wiclif, which happened in 1384. For these and other reasons, it seems clear that Wiclif had no predecessor in his vast undertaking.

That Wiclif actually performed the great work which now bears his name, is altogether certain. Knyghton, a zealous Romanist, says: "This master John Wiclif translated the Gospel out of Latin into English, and by that means laid it more open to the laity, and to women, who could read, than it used to be to the most learned of the clergy, and those of them who had the best understanding; and that which used to be precious to both clergy and laity, and the jewel of the Church, is turned into the sport of the people; so the Gospel pearl is cast abroad and trodden under foot of swine."

Wiclif's translation was made entirely from the Latin text, the only one at that time in use. It is the opinion of Sharon Turner, that Wiclif's ordinary style is less perspicuous and cultivated than that of Rolle, who lived and wrote many years earlier; but in the version of the Scriptures, "the unrivalled combination of force, simplicity, dignity, and feeling in the original, compel his old English, as they seem to compel every other language into which they are translated, to be clear, interesting, and energetic."

The following is a specimen at random of Wiclif's translation. Matt. v.: "And Jhesus seynge the people, went up into an hil; and whanne he was sette, his disciples camen to him. And he openyde his mouthe, and taughte hem; and seide, Blessid be pore men in spirit; for the kyngdom of hevenes is herun. Blessid ben mylde men; for thei schulenweelde the erthe. Blessid ben thei that mournen; for thei schal be coumfertid. Blessid be thei that hungren and

thirsten rightwisnesse ; for thei schal be fulfilled. Blessid ben merciful men ; for thei schal gete mercy. Blessid ben that ben of clene herte ; for thei schulen se God. Blessid ben pesible men ; for thei schulen be depid goddis children. Blessid ben thei that suffren persecucioun for rightwisnesse ; for the kyngdom of hevenes is hern."

That Wiclif received aid in his great work, seems highly probable. At the end of a portion of Baruch are the following words, subscribed by a different hand, and in less durable ink : " Explicit translationem Nicolay de Herford." The manuscripts of this version are to this day exceedingly numerous. His work at the time was denounced and proscribed, as tainted almost with the guilt of sacrilege. A few years after, a constitution of Archbishop Arundel declares that " it is a perilous thing, as St. Jerome testifieth, to translate the text of holy Scripture from one idiom into another; since it is no easy matter to retain in every version an identity of sense ; and the same blessed Jerome, even though he were inspired, confesseth that herein he had himself been frequently mistaken." It was therefore enacted and ordained, that " henceforth no one should translate any text of sacred Scripture, by his own authority, into the English or any other tongue, in the way of book, tract, or treatise; and that no publication of this sort, composed in the time of John Wiclif, or since, or thereafter to be composed, should be read, either in part or in whole, either in public or in private, under the pain of the greater excommunication, until such translation should be approved by the diocesan of the place ; or, if the matter should require it, by a provincial council ; every one who should act in contradiction to this order, to be punished as an abettor of *heresy* and error."

Wiclif, in his defence of the translation, says: "They who call it heresy to speak of the Holy Scriptures in English must be prepared to condemn the Holy Ghost, that gave it in tongues to the apostles of Christ, to speak the word of God in all languages that were ordained of God under heaven." In defiance of all obstructions, however, copies of the translation were circulated with astonishing rapidity among all classes of people. In 1429 the cost of a Testament of Wiclif's version was no less than £2 16*s.* 8*d.*, a sum probably equal to £30 of present money, and considerably more than half the annual income which was then considered adequate to the maintenance of a substantial yeoman. From the reign of Henry IV. to the Reformation, the owner of a fragment of Wiclif's Bible, or indeed of any other portion of his writings, was conscious of harboring a witness whose appearance would infallibly consign him to the dungeon, and possibly to the flames.* "Then," says Milton, "was the sacred Bible sought out from dusty corners; the schools were opened; divine and human learning raked out of the embers of forgotten tongues; princes and cities trooped apace to the newly erected banner of salvation; martyrs, with the unresistible

* See Wiclif's Life by Le Bas, Harper's edition, *passim*. Also the more elaborate Life, in 2 vols. 8vo, by Professor Vaughan, who made a careful search into all the Wiclif manuscripts known to be in existence. The University of Oxford has lately brought out a version of Wiclif's Old Testament, edited by Rev. J. Forshall and F. Madden, Esq., librarians of the British Museum. See also Rev. H. H. Baber's "Historical Account of the Saxon and English Versions of the Scriptures previous to the Opening of the Fifteenth Century," prefixed by Mr. Baber to his edition of Wiclif's translation of the New Testament; "in which," says Mr. Le Bas, "will be found the most complete body of information hitherto collected relative to this interesting subject."

might of weakness, shook the powers of darkness, and scorned the fiery rage of the old Red Dragon." *

The art of printing was discovered in 1452. In 1462 the Latin Bible was printed. In 1488 the Old Testament in Hebrew was printed, and in 1516 the Greek Testament was published at Basle. In 1474 the art of printing was brought into England by William Caxton, and a printing-press was set up by him at Westminster. These proceedings greatly alarmed the monks, who declaimed from the pulpits that "there was now a *new language* discovered, called Greek, of which people should beware, since it was that which produced all the heresies; that in this language was come forth a book called the *New Testament*, which was now in every body's hands, and was full of thorns and briers; that there was also another language now started up, which they called Hebrew, and those who learned it were termed Hebrews." The vicar of Croydon, Surrey, preaching at Paul's Cross, said: "*We must root out printing, or printing will root out us.*"

In England, as in other parts of Europe, the diffusion of the principles of the Reformation was accompanied with new translations into the vernacular languages. For the first *printed* English translation of any portion of the Scriptures, we are indebted to William Tindal (or Tyndale, or Tyndal). This faithful confessor was born on the borders of Wales, and was brought up from a child, says Fox, in the University of Oxford. While at Magdalen College, he read privately to certain students and fellows, some lectures in divinity. Having finished his education at Cambridge, he became a private tutor to the children of a

* Milton on Reformation in England.

Mr. Welch, in Gloucestershire. "This gentleman, as he kept a good ordinary commonly at his table, there resorted to him many times sundry abbots, deans, archdeacons, with divers other doctors and great beneficed men; who there, together with master Tindal, sitting at the same table, did use many times to enter communication, and talk of learned men, as of Luther and Erasmus; also of divers other controversies and questions upon the Scripture." Having in vain attempted to introduce himself into the Bishop of London's family, in order that he might there with greater security prosecute the design which he had formed, of translating the New Testament into English, Tindal repaired to Flanders, at the expense of a Mr. Humphrey Monmouth, of London. At Antwerp, with the assistance of the learned John Fry, or Frith, and William Roye, both afterwards put to death for their opinions, he applied himself closely to the prosecution of his design of translating the New Testament from the original Greek. It was published in 1526 (Fox says in 1527), either at Antwerp or Hamburg, without a name, in a moderate octavo volume, without calendar, concordances, or tables. Tindal annexed a *pistil* at the close of it, in which he "desyred them that were learned to amende, if aught were found amysse." Copies of this impression were imported into England, where they were very industriously dispersed and read. Archbishop Warham, and Tonstal, Bishop of London, immediately issued orders to bring in all the New Testaments translated into the vulgar tongue, that they might be burned. Those who were suspected of importing and concealing any of these books, were adjudged by the Chancellor, Sir Thomas More, to ride with their faces to the tails of their horses, with papers on their heads, and the New Testaments, and other

books which they had dispersed, hung about their cloaks, and at the Standard in Cheapside to throw them into a fire prepared for that purpose, and to be fined at the king's pleasure. An individual, having been brought before More, was asked by him who were the persons in London who abetted or supported Tindal; to which inquiry the heretical convert replied, "It was the Bishop of London who maintained him, by sending a sum of money to buy up the impressions of his Testament in order to burn it." In 1527, a second edition was published by the Dutch printers; and in 1528, a third, each of five thousand copies. The first edition consisted of fifteen hundred copies. The Dutch editions were printed in large Dutch letter, in duodecimo, with Scripture references and short notes. In the Apocalypse are twenty-one figures cut in wood, representing the matters contained in that book. A third Dutch edition was soon published in duodecimo. This rapid sale was by no means agreeable to the friends of the Romish Church. Tonstal preached against the translations, and told the people there were no fewer than two thousand mistakes in them. Sir Thomas More, who was employed by the Bishop of London to write against Tindal, and whose book was published in 1529, charges Tindal with mistranslating three words of great importance, *priests*, *church*, and *charity;* Tindal calling the first, *seniors;* the second, *congregation;* the third, *love*. He also charges him with changing *grace* into *favor*, *confession* into *knowledging*, *penance* into *repentance*, etc. More affirmed, that he had found above one thousand texts falsely translated. In 1530, a royal proclamation was issued, totally suppressing the translation. In the mean time, Tindal was busily employed in translating the Pentateuch from the Hebrew into the English, in which work he

was assisted by Miles Coverdale. It was printed in 1530, in a small octavo, at different presses, and with different types. In the Preface he complained that there was not so much as one *i* in his New Testament, if it wanted a tittle over its head, but it had been noted, and numbered to the ignorant people for a heresy. In the same year he published an answer to Sir Thomas More's treatise, in which he vindicates himself from many of the charges made against him; at the same time acknowledging imperfections of the translation in some respects.

In 1531 appeared the book of Jonah, translated by Tindal, with a large prologue. In the same year, a translation of Isaiah, by George Joye, was published at Strasbourg.* In 1534 was published a fourth Dutch edition of Tindal's New Testament, in duodecimo, with various prologues, pistils, and tables. This edition seems to have been revised by Joye. In doing this, he took the liberty to correct the translation, and to give many words their pure and native signification. He translated *resurrectio* "the life after this." At the close is the following: "Here endeth the New Testament, dylygentlye oversene and correct, and printed now agayne at Antwerp by me, widow of Christophall of Endhoven, in the year of oure Lord MDXXXIII, in August." In November came forth Tindal's second edition, or the sixth in all. In the prologue, Tindal says, "Here hast thou, most dere reader, the New Testament, or cove-

* This Joye was a native of Bedfordshire, and was educated at Cambridge. He there imbibed the truths of religion from the Gospel, and underwent many sufferings from Wolsey, Fisher, More, and other agents of the Pope. He was compelled to flee into Germany, where he translated several books of the Scripture into English. He died, 1553, a firm defender of the faith.

nant made with us of God in Christ's blood, whiche I have looked over againe now at the last with all diligence, and compared it unto the Greke, and have weeded out of it many fautes, which lacke of helpe at the begynning and oversyght did sow therein." In this prologue, Tindal expresses himself much too sharply against Joye. In his replication, Joye says, "He wold the Scripture were so puerly and plyantly translated, that it needed neither note, glose, nor scholia, so that the reader might once swimme without a cork."

"While Tindal was at Antwerp," says Fox, "a person of the name of Philips was employed by the English bishops to gain the favor of Tindal, by pretending friendly regard to him, and so to compass his ruin; which thing was the more easy to do, for in the wily subtleness of this world he was simple and inexpert. A plan was laid for his being seized in the name of the Emperor, and he was had to the castle of Filford, eighteen miles from Antwerp. Here he remained prisoner more than a year and a half. After many disputations and examinations, at last they condemned him as a heretic, by virtue of a decree of the Emperor, made at Augsburg, and shortly after brought him forth to the place of execution, and there tied him to a stake, where, with a fervent zeal, and loud voice, he cried, 'Lord, open the eyes of the king,' and then first he was with a halter strangled, and afterward consumed with fire, in the year 1536. He was a man very frugal, and spare of body, a great student, and earnest laborer, in the setting forth of the Scriptures of God. He now resteth with the glorious company of Christ's martyrs, blessedly in the Lord, who be blessed in all his saints, Amen. And thus much of W. Tindal, Christ's blessed servant and martyr."

On the 30th of March, 1533, Thomas Cranmer was consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury and Primate of all England. From the first moment of his advancement, the Archbishop was impatient for the circulation of the Scriptures in the vulgar tongue, and in December, 1534, he prevailed on the Episcopal convocation to frame an address to the king, beseeching him to decree that the Bible should be translated into English, and that the task should be assigned to such honest and learned men as his Highness should be pleased to nominate. In pursuance of this design, Cranmer divided Tindal's translation of the New Testament into nine or ten parts, which he distributed among the most learned bishops of the time; requiring that each of them should send back his portion, carefully corrected, by an appointed day. With this injunction, every man carefully complied, except Stokesley, Bishop of London, whose share of the work was the Acts of the Apostles. "I marvel much," says the insolent bishop, "what my lord of Canterbury meaneth, that thus abuseth the people, and in giving them liberty to read the Scriptures; which doth nothing else but infect them with heresy. I have bestowed never an hour on my portion, and never will; and therefore my lord of Canterbury shall have his book again, for I never will be guilty of bringing the simple people into error."

The 4th of October, 1535, just THREE HUNDRED YEARS from the present time, was signalized by the publication, for the first time, of the whole Bible in the English language. It was probably printed at Zurich, in Switzerland, by Christopher Froschover. It was dedicated to Henry VIII., in the following manner: "Unto the moost victorious Prynce and our moost gracyous soverayne Lorde, Kynge Henry the eyghth, Kynge of Englande and of Fraunce, Lorde of

Irlande, etc., defendour of the fayth, and under God the chefe and suppreme heade of the Church of Englande. The ryght and just administracyon of the laws that God gave unto Moses and Josua; the testimonye of faythfulness that God gave of David; the plenteous abundance of wysedome that God gave unto Solomon; the lucky and prosperous age with the multiplicacyon of sede which God gave unto Abraham and Sara his wyfe, be geven unto you, moost gracyous Prynce, with your dearest just wyfe and moost vertuous Pryncesse Queene JANE.* Amen, your grace's humble subjecte and daylye oratour, Myles Coverdale."

Coverdale was a native of Yorkshire, and was educated at the house of Austin Friars, Cambridge, of which Dr. Barnes, who was afterwards burned for heresy, was Prior. Entertaining the principles of the Reformation, Coverdale was compelled to fly to the Continent, where he earnestly applied himself to the study and translation of the Scriptures. Coverdale remarked, that it was "neither his labor nor desire to have this work put into his hand, but that being instantly required to undertake it, and the Holy Ghost moving other men to do the cost thereof, he was the more bold to take it in hand." He sets it forth as a special translation, "not as a checker, reprover, or despiser of other men's translations, but lowly and faithfully following his interpreters, and that under correction." He made use of five different translations. It is divided into six tomes. To the first is prefixed a "Calendar of the bokes of the hole Byble,

* As Henry was not married to Jane Seymour till May 20th, 1536, more than half a year from the date of finishing this Bible, it is probable that a new title-page was inserted after the murder of Anne Boleyn.

how they are named in English and Latyne, how long they are wrytten in the allegacions, how many chapters every book hath, and in what leafe every one begynneth." It is adorned throughout with wood-cuts, pictures, references, etc. In the last page are the words, "Prynted in the yeare of our Lorde MDXXXV, and fynished the fourth day of October." A large quarto edition of this Bible was printed in 1550, which was republished with a new title in 1553. A folio was printed in 1550, and a quarto edition in 1560. After 1561 no edition of it was printed.

In June, 1536, the convocation of the province of Canterbury ordered, that every parson or proprietary of a church should provide a Bible in Latin and English, to be laid in the choir, for every one to read at his pleasure. The people were, however, admonished against the danger of entanglement in controversial niceties, and were directed, whenever they were involved in difficulty, to apply to instructors of competent learning and of unblemished character.

In 1537 MATTHEW'S BIBLE appeared. This was an impression of the whole Bible in English, completed under the patronage of Cranmer, by two enterprising publishers, Grafton and Whitechurch. It appeared in one great folio volume. The name under which it goes, *Matthew's*, is undoubtedly fictitious. The translation was partly executed by Tindal and partly by Coverdale. It was thought prudent to conceal from the public the real authors of the work. The printing was conducted abroad, probably at Hamburg. The corrector of the whole was John Rogers, the protomartyr in Mary's reign. The volume was provided with prologues and annotations, chiefly relating to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the marriage of priests, and the

sacrifice of the mass; all of which were so offensive to the Romish party, that afterwards, during the period of their ascendency, they effected the suppression of these heretical commentaries. Cranmer was filled with exultation on the appearance of this Bible. The title of Matthew's Bible is the following: "The Bible, which is all the Holy Scripture, in which are contayned the Olde and Newe Testament, truelye and purelye translated into Englysh, by Thomas Matthewe, MDXXXVII, set forth with the King's most gracious lycence."

In the course of the year 1538, a quarto edition of the New Testament, in the Vulgate Latin, and Coverdale's English, bearing the name of Hollybushe, was printed, with the king's license, by James Nicolson. Of this, another more correct edition was published in 1539, in octavo, and dedicated to Lord Cromwell. In 1538 an edition in quarto of the New Testament, in English, with Erasmus's Latin translation, was printed, with the king's license, by Redman. In this year it was resolved to revise Matthew's Bible, and to print a correct edition of it. The printing was commenced in Paris; but the Inquisition interposed, and ordered the impression, consisting of twenty-five thousand copies, to be burned. Some of the copies, however, escaped the fire. The presses, types, and printers were conveyed to England, and in the following year the work was finished. It appeared in the form of a large folio, enriched with a noble preface by Cranmer, and consequently known by the title of CRANMER'S BIBLE. The title is as follows: "The Byble in Englyshe, that is to say, the content of all the Holy Scripture, both of the olde and newe testament, truly translated after the veryte of the Hebrue and Greke texts by the dylygent studye of diverse excellent but learned men, ex-

pert in the forseyde tonges." In this edition, Matthew's Bible was revised, and several alterations and corrections made in the translation. The additions to the Hebrew and Greek originals in the Latin Vulgate were translated, and inserted in a smaller letter than the text. A second edition was printed either in this or the following year.

Notwithstanding the repeated injunctions which had been issued for providing every church with an English Bible, there were many parishes in England still unfurnished with the sacred volume. For this reason a royal proclamation was issued in May, 1540, to enforce the ordinance in question, on the penalty of forty shillings a month, so long as the omission should continue.

In the course of the year 1539, another Bible was printed by John Byddel, called TAVERNER'S BIBLE, from the name of its conductor, Richard Taverner; who was educated at Christ Church, Oxford, patronized by Lord Cromwell, and probably encouraged by him to undertake the work, on account of his skill in the Greek tongue. It is not simply a revisal of Cranmer's Bible, nor a new version, but a kind of intermediate work, being a correction of Matthew's Bible, many of whose marginal notes are adopted, and many omitted, and others inserted by the editor. After Cromwell's death, Taverner was imprisoned in the Tower of London, through the influence of the Romish bishops. He escaped, however, and reinstated himself in the king's favor. In 1540 five editions of the whole Bible appeared, to which Cranmer prefixed a preface. In 1541 one edition of Cranmer's Bible was finished by Richard Grafton; who, in the November following, completed also another Bible of the largest volume, which was superintended, at the king's command, by Tonstal, Bishop of Durham, and

Heath, Bishop of Rochester. In 1542 a fruitless attempt was made by Cranmer to procure a revision of the New Testament. The popish party soon prevailed, and prohibited and abolished Tindal's translation, but allowed other translations to remain in force under certain restrictions. In 1544 the Pentateuch was printed by John Day and William Seres. In 1546 the king prohibited by proclamation the having and reading of Wiclif's, Tindal's, and Coverdale's translations, and prohibited the use of any other than such as were allowed by Parliament.

It is an interesting circumstance connected with the translation of the Scriptures, that the knowledge of the Hebrew and Greek languages was preserved in England to some extent. In the long period of more than a thousand years of general darkness (from 420, the date of Jerome's death, to 1494, when the illustrious Reuchlin arose), there was in England in every century, except the fifth and sixth, some scholar eminent for his knowledge of the Hebrew language. In the eleventh century, Archbishops Anselm and Lanfranc seem to have been well versed in the original languages of Scripture. The latter corrected the Vulgate by the Hebrew text. William the Conqueror permitted a great number of Jews to come over from Rouen and settle in England about the year 1087. At York, at one time, there were fifteen hundred. Hence some of the English ecclesiastics became acquainted with their books and language. In the twelfth century, Gilbert, monk of Westminster, Adelard, monk of Bath, and Daniel Morley, of Oxford, were skilled in Hebrew. In the following century, Robert Grosthead, Bishop of Lincoln, Gregory of Huntington, Robert Dodford, librarian of Ramsey, and Roger Bacon, were well acquainted with the original Scriptures. In the fourteenth

century, Richard de Bury founded a large library at Oxford, in which he provided both Hebrew and Greek grammars. In 1359 the Archbishop of Armagh enforced the necessity of having recourse to the Hebrew original in doubtful passages. In the fifteenth century, Adam of Norwich translated all the Old Testament from Hebrew into Latin, except the Psalter. One Laurence Holbech, monk of Ramsey, finished a Hebrew lexicon which had been commenced by the Jews. William Grey, Bishop of Ely, was also a most zealous student in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew.* "About the latter times of King Henry VIII.," says Strype, "many young ladies, daughters of men of nobility and quality, were bred up to skill in tongues, and other human learning, taking example, I suppose, from that king, who took special care for the educating of his daughters, as well as his son, in learning. And they were happy in learned instructors. His last wife, Catharine Parr, was a learned as well as a godly lady. And Lady Jane, the daughter of the Duke of Suffolk, that unhappy queen, had excellent learning. Dr. Meredith Hanmer read Eusebius in Greek to a certain honorable lady, as he tells us in his epistle before his English translation of that book; which gave him occasion to publish the said translation. And before all these, Sir Thomas More had a daughter named Margaret, whom he bred up in ingenuous literature. She composed a Latin oration and some verses, which her father showed to Voysey, Bishop of Exeter, whereat he was much moved with delight, and sent her a Portugué by her father, which he inclosed in a letter to her. And in 1537 there was one Elizabeth Lucar, a cit-

* See the Bishop of St. David's "Motives to the Study of Hebrew." London, 1814.

izen's wife, buried in St. Laurance Pountney's church, daughter of one Paul Withirel. She understood Latin, Spanish, and Italian, and reading them with perfect readiness and utterance. Of the women in King Edward's reign, we may judge and wonder. Nicholas Udal, in writing to Queen Catharine, says: 'But now, in this gracious and blissful time of knowledge, in which it hath pleased God Almighty to reveal and show abroad the light of his most holy Gospel, what a number is there of noble women, especially here in this realm of England, yea, and how many in the years of tender virginity, not only as well seen, and as familiarly traded in the Latin and Greek tongues as in their own mother language, but also both in all kinds of profane literature and liberal arts, exacted, studied, and exercised; and in the Holy Scriptures and theology so ripe, that they are able, aptly, and with much grace, either to indite or translate into the vulgar tongue, for the public inspection and edifying of the unlearned multitude. Neither is it now a strange thing to hear gentlewomen, instead of most vain communication about the moon shining in water, to use grave and substantial talk in Latin or Greek, with their husbands, of godly matters. It is now no news in England for young damsels in noble houses, and in the courts of princes, instead of cards and other instruments of idle trifling, to have continually in their hands either psalms, homilies, and other devoted meditations, or else Paul's Epistles or some holy book of Scripture matters; and as familiarly to read or reason thereof in Greek, Latin, French, or Italian, as in English. It is now a common thing to see young virgins so nursed and trained in the study of letters, that they willingly set all other vain pastimes at naught for learning's sake. It is now no news at all to see queens and la-

dies of most high state and progeny, instead of courtly dalliance, to embrace virtuous exercises of reading and writing, and with most earnest study, both early and late, to apply themselves to the acquiring of knowledge, as well as in all other liberal arts and disciplines, as also most especially of God, and his most holy word.' " *

Upon the accession of Edward VI., the severe statute of Henry VIII., restraining the circulation of the Scriptures, was repealed; and a royal injunction was published, that not only the whole English Bible should be placed in churches, but also the paraphrase of Erasmus in English, to the end of the four Evangelists. It was likewise ordered, that every parson, vicar, curate, etc., under the degree of a bachelor of divinity, should possess the New Testament both in Latin and English, with the paraphrase of Erasmus upon it; and that the bishops, etc., in their visitations and synods, should examine them, how they had profited in the study of the Holy Scriptures. It was also appointed that the Epistle and Gospel of the mass should be read in English; and that on every Sunday and holiday one chapter of the New Testament in English should be plainly and distinctly read at matins, and one chapter of the Old Testament at even-song. During the course of this reign, that is, in less than seven years and six months, *eleven* impressions of the whole English Bible were published, and six of the English New Testament; besides an English translation of the whole New Testament, paraphrased by Erasmus. The Bibles were printed according to the preceding editions, whether Tindal's, Coverdale's, Matthew's, Cranmer's, or Taverner's; that is, with a dif-

* Strype's Life of Archbishop Parker, pp. 179, 180.

ferent text, and different notes. It is doubtful, however, whether there were any translations, or correction of a translation, in Edward's reign.

Many of the principal Reformers having been driven to Geneva during the persecutions of Queen Mary's reign, they published in 1557 an English New Testament, printed by Conrad Badius; the first in our language which contained the distinction of verses by numerical figures, after the manner of the Greek Testament, which had been published by Robert Stephens in 1551. Stephens, indeed, published his figures in the margin, while the Geneva editors prefixed theirs to the beginning of minute subdivisions, with breaks, after our present manner. The principal translators at Geneva were Miles Coverdale, Bartholemew Traheron, Dean of Chichester, Christopher Goodman, Margaret Professor of Divinity at Oxford, Anthony Gilby, William Whittingham of Oxford, the translator of the Psalms, Thomas Sampson, afterwards Dean of Christ Church, Oxford, and Thomas Cole of Oxford. Others add John Knox, John Bodleigh, and John Pullain. They took up their residence at Geneva about the year 1555. In 1557 there appeared in a small duodecimo, "The New Testament of our Lorde Jesus Christ, conferred diligently with the Greke and best approved Translations." It is printed in a small, but very beautiful character. A second edition of this Testament, printed at Geneva, with short marginal notes in the same volume, was published in 1560. Strype intimates that this was the only English translation revised and corrected; and that, as they had finished the New Testament, they proceeded to revise the Old. Not having made an end of this revision at the time of Elizabeth's accession, some of the company remained at Geneva, to finish it. In 1560 the

whole Bible was printed at Geneva, in quarto, by Rowland Hill, with an epistle to the Queen, and another to the reader. It is said that the translators had the assistance of Calvin and Beza. This Bible has been frequently reprinted. In August, 1557, Matthew Parker, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, wrote in his Journal, "I persist in the same constancy, upholden by the grace and goodness of my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by whose inspiration I have finished the book of Psalms turned into vulgar verse."

About the year 1565, Archbishop Parker resolved to accomplish that which his predecessor, Cranmer, had attempted in vain. He distributed portions of the Scriptures to the bishops and other divines, sending his instructions in regard to the manner in which they should proceed. The Bishops of Worcester, Rochester, Man, Ely, St. David's, and Norwich, were among the number. After they had returned their translations, Parker, with other learned divines in his family, corrected the whole, and prepared the volume for the press. It appeared in 1568, both in quarto and octavo. The chapters were divided into verses, without breaks. Various alterations were made in the text, though it substantially agreed with the preceding versions. Original notes were placed in the margin by Parker. In April, 1571, a canon was made that "the church wardens should see that the Holy Bible be in every church in the largest volume, if it might conveniently be, such as were lately imprinted at London." Every clergyman was to have one of these Bibles in his family. It was reprinted in 1572, with a thorough revision, with prefaces, prolegomena, notes, etc. The work seems to have been done more carefully than that of the preceding edition. The Pentateuch was prepared by the Bishop of Oxford; the five following books, by

Richard Meneven; the next four, by the Bishop of Worcester; Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, and Job, by Andrew Peerson, a chaplain of the Archbishop's; the Psalms, by Thomas Becon, Prebendary of Canterbury; Proverbs, by an unknown person; Ecclesiastes and Solomon's Song, by Andrew P. Eliens; the three following books, by Robert Winton; Ezekiel and Daniel, probably, by Thomas Cole; the remainder of the Old Testament, by the Bishop of London; the Apocrypha, by John Norvicen; the first five books of the New Testament, by the Bishop of Ely; Romans, by an unknown person; the First Epistle to the Corinthians, by Goodman, Dean of Westminster; the remaining books, by unknown persons. The Archbishop's province was to oversee and finish the whole. He employed various persons skilled in Hebrew and Greek to compare the old translation with the original text, and also with other translations. One of these critics was Laurence, who read Greek to Lady Cecil.*

The Romanists, finding that it would be impossible to keep the Bible out of the hands of the common people, resolved to have an English translation of their own. Accordingly, in 1582, appeared the Rheimish New Testament in quarto, printed at Rheims by John Fogny. They translated from the vulgar Latin, they said, "because the Latin was the most ancient; it was corrected by St. Jerome, commended by St. Austin, and used and expounded by the fathers; the holy Council of Trent had declared it to be authentical; it was the gravest, sincerest, of greatest majesty, and the least partiality. It was exact and precise according to the Greek; preferred by Beza himself to all other

* Laurence's critical notes are in the Appendix to Strype's Life of Parker, and display considerable acumen.

translations, and *was truer than the vulgar Greek text itself.*" A great number of words they left untranslated, as Pasche, Neophyte, Prepuce, etc. They of course used the words *penance*, *host*, *traditions*, *woman* for *wife*, etc. The other part of this translation, namely, the Old Testament, was not published till about twenty-seven years afterwards, when it was printed at Douay, in two volumes, quarto, the first in the year 1609, the other the year after. The authors of this translation were William Allyn, Gregory Martin, and Richard Bristol. The annotations are said to have been made by Thomas Worthington.*

After the death of Archbishop Parker, a number of editions of the Bible were printed. Portions of it were also translated anew. James I., soon after his accession to the throne, came to the resolution to bring out a new translation. The result, as is well known, is our existing authorized version. An exact reprint, page for page, of James's Bible of 1611, has been lately put forth in England. There seems to be, at present, no edition, which can lay claim to the authority of a correct standard text. The earlier editions differ among themselves; and even the same copy is discrepant with itself; that which corresponds to Italics in later editions (the first edition is in black letter, and the distinction is made by employing small Roman letters) and other printing notifications not being reduced to system. In the same book, in the same chapter, perhaps in the same verse, of the edition of 1611, may be found the same expression differently printed in respect of typographical character, when the original required that it should be printed in the same manner. This is said to be the case with the earlier editions generally. In this matter, the modern

* Several editions of the Douay Bible have been recently published.

editions, since the days of Blayney, are far more consistent. In 1638 an attempt was made to render the text consistent with itself in regard to Italics. Dr. Blayney's further revision was completed in 1769. For many years his was considered the standard edition. But subsequently, an edition printed by Eyre and Strahan eclipsed that of Dr. Blayney. The Rev. Thomas Curtis, an English Baptist clergyman, who has devoted much attention to this subject, has found a great number of errors in the edition of Eyre and Strahan. We are happy to learn that a critical investigation of this subject has been commenced in this country, in the right quarter. Two first-rate proof-readers are comparing the first edition of James with the one now in common use. Not regarding the difference of orthography, they note, first, the omission of capitals; second, difference in punctuation, particularly of commas; third, a difference in Italic words. The changes in all the above respects are found to be numerous, and yet they do not materially affect the sense.*

We subjoin a specimen of various translations of the Lord's Prayer.

1. *Pure Anglo-Saxon, written about A. D.* 890.	*Translation.*
Faeder ure þu þe eart on heovenum	Father our thou who art in heaven,
Si þin nama gehalgod,	Be thy name hallowed,
To — becume þin rice	Come thy kingdom,
Gewurde þin willa on eorwan swa swa, on heovenum,	Be done thy will in earth so as in heaven,

* Had Professor Edwards rewritten this Essay within the last two years, he would have added several facts to this paragraph, and also to the paragraph on pp. 272, 273.

Urne daeghramlican hlar syle us do daew,
And forwyf us ure wyldas
Swa swa we forwifað urum gyldendum,
And ne gelaedde þu us on cordnunge,
Ac alys us of yhele.
Soþlice.

Our daily loaf sell us to day,
And forgive us our guith
So as we forgive our debtors,
And not lead thou us into costening,
But release us from evil.
Soothly (truly).

2. *About A. D.* 1180.

Fader ure thu ert in heune,
Blessed be thi name,
Cume thi rixlenge
þurthe thi þil on eorthe sþo it is on heune,
Gif us to-day ure daigþamlicle bread.
And forgive us ure gultes sþo þe den hem here the us agult,
Habbeth shild us from elche prince of helle,
Aeles us of alle iuele,
Amen. Sþo it þurthe.

3. *About A. D.* 1250.

Fadir ur that es in hevene,
Halud be thy nam to revere;
Thou do us thi rich rike,
Thy will on erd be wrought elk,
Als it es wrought in heven ay;
Er ilk day brede give us to day:
Forgive thou all us dettes urs
Als we forgive till ur detturs;
And ledde us in na fanding,
But sculd us fra ivel thing.

4. *Wiclif's Translation*, *A. D.* 1380.

Our Fadir that art in hevenys
Halewid be thi name
Thi kyngdom come to,
Be thi wil done in erthe as in hevene.

5. *Tindal's*, 1526.

Our Father which art in heaven,
Halowed by thy name.
Let thy kingdom come.
Thy will be fulfilled as well

Give to us this day oure breed ovir othir substaunce,
And forgive to us our dettis as we forgiven to oure dettoris;
And lede us not into temptacioun;
But delyvere us from yvel,
Amen.

6. *Matthew's*, 1537.

O oure Father which arte in heven,
Halowed be thy name.
Let thy kingdome come.
Thy will be fulfilled as well in erth as it is in heven.
Geve us this daye oure dayly bred,
And forgeve us our trespasses even as we forgeve our trespascers.
And lead us not into temptacion,
But delyver us from evyll.
Amen.

8. *Geneva*, 1556.

Our Father which art in heaven,
in earth as it is heven.
Geve us this day ur dayly bred,
And forgive us oure dettes as we forgive ur detters,
And leade us not into temptation,
But delyver us from evyll
For thyne is the kyngdome and the glorye forever,
Amen.

7. *Cranmer's*, 1541.

Our Father whych arte in heaven,
Halowed be thy name.
Let thy kyngdome come.
Thy wyll be fulfylled as wel in earth as it is heaven.
Geve us thys daye our dayly breade,
And forgeve us oure dettes as we forgeve oure detters.
And leade us not into temptacion,
But delyver us from evel.
For thyne is the kyngdome and the power and the glorye
For ever. Amen.

Authorized Version.

Our Father which art in heaven,

Holowed be thy name.	Hallowed be thy name.
Thy kingdome come	Thy kingdom come.
Thy will be done even in earth as it is in heaven	Thy will be done in earth, as *it is* in heaven.
Give us this day our dayly bread	Give us this day our daily bread.
And forgive us our debts as wee also forgive our debtors.	And forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors.
And lead us not into temtation	And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil:
But deliver us from evil,	
For thine is the kingdome and the power and the glory	For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory,
For ever, Amen.	For ever, Amen.

The public libraries in the United States are very deficient in specimens of the early English versions. The library at Cambridge has the Bible Annotations of 1645, folio, without the text; Cranmer's Bible, folio of 1539 and quarto of 1541; Barker's, 1578, folio; Geneva, 1584, and 1608, both quarto; Wiclif's New Testament, Lewis's edition; New Testament Englished from Beza, by L. Thompson, quarto, 1583; and Fulke's New Testament, 1633. The Boston Athenæum has an edition of the Bible, folio, 1578; Barker's quarto, 1589; Coverdale's quarto, 1599; octavo, 1624; quarto, 1630. The library of the Massachusetts Historical Society contains no copy, unless it be a fragment. The library of the American Antiquarian Society, we have understood, has several specimens. In the library of the Andover Theological Seminary are Barker's folio, 1578, Geneva black letter, and the same in quarto, 1579. The Rev. Dr. Jenks of Boston has a black letter quarto volume,

containing "the thyrde parte of the Bible," from Psalms to Malachi, a good edition, without date, but supposed to be Cranmer's Bible; also a thin quarto volume, containing a fragment of the same, supposed to be of the year 1541, beginning with the seventeenth chapter of 1 Kings, and ending with Job, including, under the titles of 1 and 2 Esdras, the books of Ezra and Nehemiah; and a copy of the Geneva version of the whole Bible, octavo, printed at Geneva, by John Crespin, 1568, a beautiful copy, including the Apocrypha.

At the close of this article, we are happy to present the following communication from the Rev. Dr. Jonathan Homer, of Newton, Mass., a gentleman who has given a long and indefatigable attention to this subject, and who is more intimately acquainted with it than any other individual in the country.

"I am now engaged," says Dr. Homer, "in writing out for the press a History of the English Bible Translations between the time of Wiclif, 1380, and Tindal, 1526, and that of our authorized version of 1611, in the reign of James I. It has grown out of an attempt, commenced in 1824, to correct the errors of the English text and the interpretation of the original text, where there was a very general agreement of the learned, especially among those reputed orthodox, who enjoyed the esteem of our New England fathers, and of others, who were eminent men in the last century. Having previously ascertained some particulars of the history of the present translation, especially as connected with the translation, published complete in 1560, of the English exiles at Geneva in the reign of Mary; and having read, too, of the high estimation of that translation by the Puritans up to the time of the settlement of New England,

a period of sixty or seventy years, I became solicitous to collate its text with that of James's version, and of the Hebrew and Greek originals. By the kind and diligent search of a friend and companion of my early years (between 1766 and 1773), Admiral Sir Isaac Coffin, I obtained, in 1824, a complete copy, folio, containing text, explanatory notes, plates, and maps. I soon found, that this Bible was wholly free from those errors of translation, which had been alleged by the Puritans (at Hampton Court Conference, 1603, before James) to exist in the Bishops' Bible, — a Bible in use by the Established Church for nearly forty years. It had been gotten up (as the Germans speak) by Queen Elizabeth as an opposition Bible to the English Geneva version of 1560.* On further examination of the Geneva Bible, it appeared that many of the obsolete words, and errors in grammar and syntax, found in James's version, are not in the Geneva. By a continued collation of the two Bibles, in both Testaments, and each further compared with the originals, by the aid of the best lexicons, foreign versions, and English and foreign comments, the Geneva Bible, though sometimes improved in the last translation, by the aid of Tremellius, and Junius, and Beza, the French Geneva, etc., yet contained many preferable translations. These served to justify the remark of the late learned Catholic, Dr. M. Geddes, and apparently approved by Archbishop Newcome, who hesitated not to declare, that he thinks it, *in general*, better than King James's translation. I then proceeded, being favored with the Bishops' Bible by my esteemed friend, Rev. S. Sewall, of Burlington, Mass., to collate the common version with it. This Bible was the prescribed

* See A. Pfeiffer's Critica Sacra, II. p. 791.

standard of King James's Bible, according to the first rule given by James to his translators. The ordinary Bible read in the church, commonly called the Bishops' Bible, *is to be followed, and as* LITTLE ALTERED *as the original will permit.* This rule, in addition to another, — 'That signification of a word in the original which was commonly used by the ancient fathers, and is agreeable to *the analogy of faith*'; and the ordinance obtained through Archbishop Bancroft's influence, 'not to append notes of any kind' to their translation, — must obviously have infringed on the private judgment of their most critical men, who would desire to justify a variation by a note. These, Dr. Gell, chaplain to Archbishop Abbot, one of the translators, describes as attempting in vain a more perfect critical version. James's Bible was found to contain, in its New Testament, by numbering the words, eighty-nine ninetieths of the translation of the Bishops' Bible, of the Geneva Bible, and other English versions, repetitions and synonymous words excepted; embracing a little more than two thousand new words. In collating the Old Testament, it appeared, that, particularly from the book of Job to the end of Malachi, they had more frequently departed from their standard, and conformed their version more to the English Geneva. In an examination of all the books of the Bishops' Bible, it appeared to contain several texts better rendered than James's, and to omit sundry *ands*, *nows*, *alsos*, *it came to pass*, etc., which, unlike the ancient English Bibles, spread themselves with such frequency, without aid to an English ear, over the authorized version.

"I then, proceeding in my search of old English versions, found a New Testament of Edward the Sixth's time, large quarto, with notes, A. D. 1552, which I collated throughout.

I found about the same time a Coverdale's Tindal, apparently of 1551, or possibly of 1561. This is probably a reprint, with further variations, throughout all the books, derived from Luther's German Bible, etc., of Tindal's last and best Testament, 1536, published by Coverdale, after Tindal's martyr-death in Flanders.

"In my further search, Divine Providence aided my object by the Matthew's Bible, 1537, folio, in old English text, deficient, by some accident, in the text, etc., after the sixteenth chapter of Luke. This was obtained for free and critical use, by the immediate and kind agency of a son of my lately esteemed friend, the deceased and lamented Thomas P. Ives, Esq., of Providence, from the library of Brown University. This translation was soon found by me to be the exceedingly rare Bible of 1537, being the revision of the translations of William Tindal, 1530 and 1532, of the Pentateuch, and perhaps to Nehemiah, and of the prophet Jonah, and of his New Testaments of 1526 and 1534. It contained also a revision of the translation of Miles Coverdale from Genesis to Revelation, of 1535, by John Rogers, the learned and holy martyr in Mary's reign. This was completed about the close of 1537. This translation was executed at Wittemberg, near the person of Luther, and the learned professors of the University, and near the rich collection of books of its library. These, Rogers, under the book-name of Thomas Matthew, appears freely and advantageously to have used. With these I obtained also, by the hand of my early friend and Boston grammar school mate, Thomas Walcut, Esq., the CRANMER BIBLE, quarto, as overseen by Tonstal and Heath, Roman Catholic bishops, published in November, 1541. I have also enjoyed the free and repeated use of the Great Bible, called Cranmer's, being the first

published, in 1539, after the preceding Bibles and New Testaments had been put down by the authority of Henry VIII. This is in the library of Harvard University. These two Bibles, differing little from each other, I have also collated in all their parts, and traced them successfully to their sources, other than the original. So I affirm of King James's Bible, *This is in no part a new translation taken directly from the originals.** Those parts of King James's Bible, which were drawn from Luther, were not taken by them from the German Bible, but by the early translators, from whom they borrowed the English version. This I have everywhere traced to the English, French, Latin, or German versions, which preceded it. This circumstance I found proved by a full exploring of the New Testament in 1828. It has been since confirmed in every book of the Old Testament, and will be further confirmed to any one by the reading of the Preface of the last translators, contained in Dr. Coit's valuable duodecimo Bible, just published

* In a note which Dr. Homer published in the Biblical Repository, July, 1836, he adds: "The stationers, not the translators, styled the Bible 'a new translation,' and announced it as 'newly translated out of the original tongues.' The translators testify in their Preface (the work of Bishop Smith, a translator and reviser), that their own revision 'is *in no part* a new translation.' 'We never thought,' say they, 'that we should need to make *a new translation*, but to make a good one [their prescribed standard was the Bishops', or Archbishop Parker's, Bible of 1568] better; or out of many good ones, *one principal good one*.'" "This fact is further confirmed by Dr. Gell, probably from the information of the wise and good Archbishop Abbot, one of the translators, whose chaplain he had been. Dr. Gell's words are as follows: 'Where a part of the learned body suggested certain corrections and improvements in the translation, they were checked, and told that their proposed course *would go to a new translation*, which was never intended.'"

by Manson and Grant. I possess also an ancient varying translation of the Epistle to the Ephesians. I possess also Tindal's text of his first and exceedingly rare Testament of 1526, in the text of Matthew fifth, sixth, and seventh chapters, and in the five chapters of John's First Epistle, with rich informing notes and observations upon each chapter and verse, except 1 John v. 7. This Tindal, Coverdale, and Rogers supposed not contained in any known ancient Greek manuscript, and only supported by Latin and Roman Catholic authority. I possess, too, several parts of Tindal's earliest translation, 1526, contained in his published works, quoting Scripture passages. I have free access to a work containing the principal passages contained in Coverdale's Bible of 1535, wherein it agrees or disagrees, in its text, with the Thomas Matthew's Bible of 1537, the Cranmer Bible of 1539, the Geneva of 1560, the Bishops' of 1568, and the Common Version of 1611. Also, I have before me variations and corrections of the old text by Becke and other learned men, in the reigns of Henry VIII. and Edward VI.

"With an exception of one memorable year of extraordinary attention to personal religion, in 1826 and 1827, among the beloved flock which I had served since 1782, I have employed myself, for a portion of eleven years, in collating and comparing all of these Bibles and Testaments with each other, with the originals, with the principal versions and comments and lexicographers of the last three centuries, to the present date. I have compared them also with the notes which I began to collect at the age of seventeen from the books of Harvard College library, and which have been accumulating for fifty-eight years, following my collegiate course. Prompted by the conscientious religious

motive of the venerated, learned, and indefatigable German, Bengel (obiit 1752), for about forty years I have paid critical attention to various readings in both Testaments, of Hebrew and Greek text and of ancient respected versions, and have examined the authorities for and against them, individually. I have endeavored, particularly, to mark those in which the old English versions and the orthodox, or those of James's creed among the learned, are agreed, with few or no exceptions. I have found, as the result, that the Cranmer Bible, the Bishops' Bible, and the King James's Bible were not independently rendered. Cranmer's was published under the dread of the frown and rejection of Henry VIII. and his clergy. Cranmer was dissatisfied with it, and sent for three eminent critics from Germany, on Edward's ascent to the throne, to effect a new translation. This was frustrated by the early death of the two principals, Bucer and Fagius. Further, the Bishops' was but a slight variation from Cranmer, and the French and English Geneva. King James's Bible was under the control of the very arbitrary James and his primate, men of strong prejudice and of no Hebrew, if any Greek, learning, — mere Latin scholars. It is throughout a version drawn from other versions and comments, not exceeding twenty. It was carried on with the felt early loss of their two greatest scholars, — Hebrew Professor Lively, and the President, Dr. Reynolds.

" Each translation has *its special good renderings, corresponding with the best modern critics.* The Bible of 1537 best agrees with Gesenius, Stuart, and the richest portions of Rosenmueller. It was executed by the first three Hebrew, Greek, and English scholars, and thorough Germans, ever known among the several translators. The New Testa-

ment of Rogers's Bible, 1537, and Coverdale's Tindal of 1551, and Tindal's first Testament of 1526, are in English idiom, and they are executed most in conformity with the latest and best Biblical critics. From the whole, with the consulted aid of more than two hundred critical works, including the sources of each translation, I have long been seeking to improve the text of the common version."

AUTHENTICITY AND GENUINENESS OF THE PENTATEUCH.*

It is certainly not the part of wisdom to introduce to the American public, indiscriminately, the sceptical opinions on morals and religion which prevail in Europe. Some of these opinions will soon perish on the soil that gave them birth. Before they can be confuted, they will cease to exist.† Other opinions are so interwoven with habits of thinking peculiar to the people of Continental Europe; they are the product of a state of society, philosophical and religious, so unlike our own; that the attempt on our part to controvert, or even to apprehend them, would be a fruitless labor.

But some of the opinions referred to are not indigenous in France or Germany only. They are by no means exotics in English or American soil. Indeed, not a few of the most destructive theories that prevail in Germany were

* This Essay was originally published in the Bibliotheca Sacra, Vol. II. pp. 356 – 398, 668 – 682. It contains the substance of several Lectures delivered before the Junior Class of Andover Theological Seminary.

† F. A. Wolf is said to have remarked, that "what comes forward in Germany with *éclat*, may be expected, for the most part, to end, after some ten years, *shabbily*."

transplanted from England. The German sceptic is the lineal descendant of men who once figured in English literature. Doubts or disbelief in respect to the doctrines of revelation, which exist among us, are the spontaneous growth of our own institutions and habits of thought, and have been only reinforced from abroad. It has been obvious, for a number of years, that there has been an increasing tendency in certain quarters to question or reject the divine authority of the Old Testament. This has been manifest in the case of some individuals, who have no special regard for German literature, or who may have even a positive antipathy to it. The origin of their doubts is either within themselves, or it must be ascribed to habits of thinking and acting peculiar to Americans. Foreign scepticism is not specially in fault.

While the Old Testament generally is assailed, the Pentateuch is made the subject of special attack. Moses, it is alleged, is the least trustworthy of the Jewish historians, or rather, the genuineness of the Pentateuch is denied altogether, and its authorship unceremoniously thrust down to the Babylonish captivity, or still later. Many of the miraculous events which it describes are regarded as no better than Rabbinic fables or Grecian myths.

It may be well here to inquire, briefly, into some of the grounds of this prevalent scepticism. Why are the Hebrew Scriptures, and the five books of Moses particularly, subjected to these fresh assaults? Some causes may exist which have hitherto been unknown, or comparatively inoperative.

A prominent ground of this sceptical tendency is the injudicious or incorrect method which has been pursued by not a few orthodox interpreters of the Old Testament. They have never distinctly seen the relations which exist between

the Old Testament and the New. They do not, practically at least, recognize the great truth, that God has communicated his revelations gradually. They have looked for the meridian sun in the faint light of the morning. They seem never to have entered into the spirit of the declarations, that *Christ* brought life and immortality to light, and that the least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than the illustrious forerunner of our Lord. In their view, the patriarchs did not see through a glass darkly, but enjoyed almost the perfect vision of the Apostles. A system of types, extending to minute particulars, and to bad men as well as to good, has been forced into the interpretation of the Old Testament, to the detriment of all sound philology, and often of common sense. Men of eminent learning, in our own days, have found in the Mosaic ritual all varieties of allegory and hidden sense, so that, almost literally, every cord has cried out of the tabernacle, and every pin from its timber has answered. In the predictions of the Old Testament, a speciality, or a minute historical reference, has been discovered, alike at variance with the nature of prophecy and the actual events of history. In such circumstances, reasonable men might naturally be deterred, not only from adopting such a method of interpretation, but from placing much confidence in the inspired records themselves. They insensibly learn to question the authenticity of a document which is susceptible of a hundred warring interpretations. Wearied with the incongruities or absurdities of the annotator, they have become distrustful of that on which he has wasted his pains.

Another source of the scepticism in question is the supposed incompatibility of some of the discoveries of modern learning with the records of the Pentateuch. The students

of natural science confidently affirm the indefinite antiquity of our globe, and describe the wonderful operations which were going on in its bosom ages before man was formed upon its surface. Some of these investigators, it must be confessed, proceed as independently as if the Mosaic records did not exist; or if these ancient documents should chance to cross their track, they brush them aside with as little ceremony as they would the cosmogony of Ovid, or the theory of Burnet. On the other hand, some theologians have been unduly sensitive in respect to these conclusions of geology, not remembering that revelation and true science will never be found, ultimately, at variance, and that the period of their apparent discrepancy is generally short. But instead of waiting for time to unfold the mystery, they have denied or denounced, in their zeal for revelation, the unquestionable facts of science. In these circumstances, a third party interpose and cut the knot which they cannot untie. They discern no difficulty in the case, for the book of Genesis is a common history, a mixture of things credible and incredible, or it is a highly seasoned poetical composition. If a discovery of science conflicts with a statement of Moses, then the latter is set aside as having no more authority than an affirmation of Diodorus or Livy. Thus these apparent conflicts between philology and natural science are inconsiderately made the ground of denying the credibility of the written history.

Another cause, which may be mentioned, is the contradictory views which have been entertained in respect to certain usages tolerated or regulated in the Pentateuch, but which a more spiritual dispensation has been supposed to abolish. In relation to these usages, opinions diametrically opposite have been defended. According to one party, the

customs referred to have the immediate Divine sanction. They are not simply the growth of an early state of society, or of Oriental institutions, but they meet necessities which are common to man. They are essential to, or at least are admissible in, the most perfect condition of humanity. Another party, by doing violence to the language of the Pentateuch, virtually deny the existence of these customs, or endeavor to rid them of their most essential characteristics. Affirming that certain usages of modern times are in their own nature and always wrong, they wrest the plainest texts of the Pentateuch from their obvious sense, in order to free the inspired word from the calumny of their opponents. Others, in the mean time, look with equal contempt upon both of these conflicting opinions. Their scepticism is only augmented by this radical diversity of ideas in those who believe in the divine authority of the Pentateuch. They regard the custom which has been proscribed or eulogized, as merely an evidence of a very barbarous state of society, and the regulations of the lawgiver respecting it, as well as the record of the historian, as unauthoritative and uninspired. And it must be acknowledged, that nothing could be better fitted to cherish an unbelieving spirit than the extreme opinions that have been alluded to. Reasonable men may well hesitate to receive a revelation to which its friends apply the most hostile modes of interpretation. In fact every text distorted, every interpretation far-fetched or unnatural, does something towards subverting the authority of the entire Scriptures, as it becomes a source of doubt and incredulity which extends far beyond itself.

The superficial philanthropy and religion, which find not a little currency in our land, are an additional cause of the scepticism in question. The special design of the New

Testament, it is alleged, is to reveal, or render more impressive, the doctrines of the immortality of the soul and the paternal character of God. An unavoidable inference from such an allegation is, that the Deity of the Old Testament is different from, or hostile to, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. The Mosaic Divinity is a stern tyrant, or an inflexible judge, not a Being of overflowing benignity. The theophany on Sinai is the fiction of Oriental fancy, portraying the *avatar* of some malignant demon. A view of the Divine character extensively prevails at the present day, which is adverse to the entire spirit of the New Testament, and which virtually leads to the denial of the most explicit declarations made by the Saviour himself. Religion is divested of its commanding features, and is made to meet the necessities of a part of our constitution only. The susceptibilities of fear, and of reverence for law and authority, though as much original properties of man as pity or any other power that has been most abundantly appealed to, are degraded and cast out as worthless.

These superficial views of religion naturally lead to a superficial philanthropy. The tenderest compassion is felt for the criminal, or rather for the unfortunate individual overtaken in a fault, while few tears are shed for injured virtue, or for society menaced with dissolution. A sacredness is attributed to human life, which has no warrant either in the New Testament or the judgment of a pure-minded philanthropist, and which would annihilate the right or possibility of national or individual self-defence. The reformation of the delinquent, it is confidently alleged, is the only, or the principal, object of human laws. The Old Testament, and the Pentateuch especially, standing as obstacles in the path of these charitable sentiments, must be set

aside. Though the representation, that the books of Moses breathe an implacable spirit, is altogether unfounded, yet there is much in them of a rigorous character, and which would be repugnant to the opinions and feelings to which we have alluded. It is unquestionable, that there is a strong tendency at present towards an indiscriminate philanthropy, and a religion divested of those stern features which the representations of the New Testament imply, as certainly as those of the Old. Now just so far as this tendency prevails, an influence adverse to the authority of the Pentateuch is brought into active existence. The question is judged subjectively, in accordance with the feelings and opinions of the objector. A fair estimate is not of course to be anticipated. Yet no topic in the whole compass of literature demands greater freedom from theological prepossession, than one pertaining to the infancy of our race (fifteen centuries before the Gospel was published), to an Oriental state of society, and to a pastoral mode of life. What might seem perfectly unreasonable and distasteful to us, might be most befitting to the incipient Hebrew commonwealth, and might, therefore, have come from God.

Again, some of the causes of this scepticism have multiplied themselves. The tendency to doubt has been greatly strengthened by exercise. The rejection of all supernatural agency from the Mosaic narratives is an effect as well as a cause. Parts of the Christian records had before been violently impugned. Doubts had been thrown upon the authenticity of no inconsiderable portion of the New Testament. In opposition to the best critical authorities, suspicions were cast on various passages. If the first chapter of the Gospel of John, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, are obnoxious to attack, a book composed sixteen hundred years

earlier, and consequently supported by much less external testimony, would hardly escape. If parts of the New Testament are seriously menaced, the whole of the Old would seem to totter on its foundations.

For these and other reasons, which might be named, it is proposed to discuss several topics that have relation to the authenticity and genuineness of the Pentateuch. New light is constantly thrown upon the interpretation of this part of the Bible, by the studies of eminent scholars and the discoveries of archæologists and travellers. A somewhat extended range of observation and of reference to authorities may be allowed, from the bearing of such remarks and references on a number of points which may be subsequently considered.

What has been already stated may suggest, not unnaturally, the first topic for consideration.

I. The Importance of Caution in an Inquiry of this Nature.

Nothing can be more out of place than dogmatic assertion, or that cavalier tone which is sometimes assumed. The subject is of such a character as not to admit of mathematical certainty. After the most laborious inquiries, we are necessarily left in ignorance on some points; while on others, we can only approximate towards the truth.

In the first place, the Pentateuch professes to stand altogether by itself. There is no contemporary literature. Not a fragment of any record besides has floated down the stream of time. The lapse of ages has buried up every other chronicle. Centuries elapsed after the exodus of Israel, before Hesiod or Homer wrote. The monuments of Egypt are silent on the first twenty centuries of the history

in Genesis. We have nothing, therefore, with which to compare the Pentateuch. We are left to judge of its credibility by its own independent testimony.

Again, a state of civil and religious society, manners and customs, useful arts and domestic institutions, are delineated or alluded to, with which we have little analogous. The principles of human nature are, indeed, the same. *Man's* heart beats alike under an Oriental or a Western sky. But the whole external *contour* is widely diverse. Even the development of Asiatic character and morals often seems to us very anomalous. We are tempted to look with perfect incredulity on incidents or narratives, which, to an Oriental, have the clearest verisimilitude. We often set up European taste as a standard for Asiatic manners, and wonder at the oddity of patriarchal usages, while an Arab or a Syrian would look with equal incredulity or contempt upon many things which have become as a second nature to us. From this dissimilarity, or contrariety, of manners and customs, the inquirer must needs be cautious in coming to his conclusions. He may pronounce that to be a myth or a saga which is veritable history.

Furthermore, it is to be remembered, that the Pentateuch lays claim to Divine inspiration. Moses is the organ of the will of God. The five books profess to be a record of immediate revelations from Heaven. This demands at least an external respect, a show of decency. Even portions of the mythology of Greece and Rome cannot be contemplated with levity. It is, in a sense, holy ground. If no heavenly voice proceeds from Delphi, yet there is a struggling of the human spirit to pierce the secrets of the future. If there was nothing acceptable to the Deity in the countless sacrifices which were offered on Roman altars, yet the

human soul is here revealed in its deepest aspirations. In the immolation of the innocent victim was prefigured the necessity of the shedding of more costly blood. In these misapplied and unauthorized services, some vital doctrines of the Christian system may be faintly shadowed forth. Though embodying a great amount of error, or of perverted truth, yet one would not approach this mythology with profane sarcasm. At all events, he would subject it to a careful and conscientious examination.

So in respect to the Mohammedan Bible. It claims to be a revelation from Heaven. These claims ought to be candidly and fairly met. A system of religious imposture is not to be dismissed with a sneer; much less, if, with its absurdities, it contains some acknowledged and fundamental truths. Every principle of literary justice, not to speak of moral obligation, demands that we should carefully examine, rather than dogmatically decide.

Yet how different has been the treatment to which the Pentateuch has often been subjected. It assumes to be a revelation from the true God, and a history of real events. It appears, in the first aspect of it at least, to be plain prose, not poetry, nor fable, nor allegory. Yet it has often been treated as though it were, *a priori*, fictitious, as though it bore the marks of falsehood on its face. A respectable uninspired author has been seldom compelled to submit to such manifest injustice. Multitudes of critics, not a few of them Christian ministers, have regarded it as a mixture of truth and falsehood, or as an interpolated document, and have accordingly tried to sift out some facts from the mass of errors. Where patient investigation would be a too painful process, an innuendo, a covert sneer, or a bold assertion, has been substituted. Decisions have been pro-

nounced with that categorical assurance, which would not be respectful in relation to a common historian, which would not be authorized, were the writers contemporaries of the men on whom they sit in judgment. Many of those, who have impugned the authority of the Pentateuch, have betrayed a state of mind, which would not well befit a student even of the Korân or Vedas.

II. Historical Scepticism less Prevalent now than formerly.

It is an important consideration in its bearings on the question under discussion, that the spirit of extreme literary scepticism, which prevailed a few years since, especially in Germany, is giving place to sounder and more conservative views. The day of unlimited suspicion in respect to ancient authors has passed by. A more enlightened criticism has shown, that incredulity may involve as many absurdities as superstition, and that the temper of mind, in which such men as Gibbon looked at certain parts of the records of antiquity, was as truly unphilosophical as that of the most unreflecting enthusiast.

In the latter part of the last century, and during the first twenty years of the present, several causes conspired to give an extraordinary growth to this doubting spirit. Some of these are still more or less operative; the influence of others has disappeared. It may be well to advert to some of the more prominent.

One of these causes is itself a consequence of the intellectual and moral condition of Germany. The number of highly educated men in the German States is very large in proportion to the population, much larger than the intellectual wants of the country demand. The government, having in its

hands nearly all the places of trust and emolument, looks, of course, to the abler and more promising candidates for public favor. This awakens among the thousands annually emerging from the university life, a spirit of rivalry and a strong desire for notoriety. Attention must be aroused, a name must be created, at all events. If the promulgation of correct opinions will not effect the object, paradoxes may. While sound reasoning will fall heavily on the public ear, ingenious, though baseless, hypotheses will be certain to awaken discussion. To attack the credibility of an ancient historian, with great confidence, and with a profusion of learning, may procure an appointment, if it does not accomplish its professed object. Thus the aim often is to make a sensation, rather than to elicit the truth; to show off one's smartness, more than to comprehend a subject in its various bearings and worthily present it. A prurient love of novelty and innovation is fostered. Well-ascertained facts in history will go for nothing, if a doubt or a suspicion can be started. The mind is not suffered to dwell on ten degrees of positive testimony, if two of a negative character can by any possibility be imagined. A habit of scepticism is thus formed, which no amount of evidence can satisfy. How else can we account for an attack on the credibility of such a book as that of the Acts of the Apostles, or a denial of the historical character of the Gospels? In these cases, the fault cannot be in the historian, or in the contemporary witnesses. Germany has been overstocked with students. The reapers outnumbered the sheaves to be gathered. Topics for investigation were sought beyond the limit of lawful inquiry, or where the only result would be to unsettle all faith in human testimony. From this unpractical character of the German

mind, and from the crowded condition of certain departments of study, an unrestrained rationalism was inevitable.

Yet there is reason to believe, that this unhealthful state of the intellectual German world has been somewhat meliorated. The physical sciences and the practical arts are exciting a more earnest attention. The orthodox theologians of Germany have been compelled, by the pressure of recent events, to place a much higher value on the historical evidences of Christianity.

Another cause of this scepticism has been a theory, quite prevalent, not only in Germany, but throughout Christendom, which represents the early state of man as savage; in other words, man came a child in knowledge from the hands of his Maker, and very gradually, and with great painstaking, acquired a knowledge of the most necessary arts of life. This theory was the cause, in a measure, of the attack on the integrity of the Homeric poems, and of the postponement to a very late period of the discovery of alphabetic writing. It has led to a representation of the patriarchs and early ancestors of the Hebrews, which would elevate them not much above the herdsmen of the Arabian desert. Accordingly, it were not to be expected that written documents, credible historical records, should exist in this crude and forming state of society. The declaration of Moses, that he committed certain facts to writing, itself betrays, it is said, an author who lived as late as David, or the Babylonish captivity.

Yet profounder investigations into ancient history and monuments are every year undermining this imposing and wide-spread hypothesis. The arts in Egypt, at the remotest point of time to which we can trace them, were in a style of the highest perfection. Some of the sciences ap-

pear to have made no inconsiderable progress in Babylon, anterior to the limits of authentic profane history, corroborating the brief allusions in the book of Genesis. So the Phœnicians were engaged in an extensive commerce, implying much progress in some of the arts, before the Homeric poems were composed. They were the medium, says Boeckh, of conveying some of the scientific knowledge of the Chaldeans to the Greeks. The simplicity of manners and habits, which prevailed in those early ages, is to be by no means assumed as an index of barbarism; it is rather an evidence of the contrary. Were we to trace the principal forms of heathenism as far towards their source as we can, there is every reason to believe that we should find no evidence that the earliest ages were the darkest. Rays of divine light, which might have illuminated the first dwellers in Egypt, Babylon, and India, were gradually lost in the deepening gloom.

We may name, as a third cause of the prevalence of this historical unbelief, the habit of transferring the method of interpreting pagan mythology to the Jewish Scriptures. We can hardly open a recent commentary on the Pentateuch, without meeting on almost every page the technical terms which Ottfried Müller and others have sanctioned in relation to Greek mythology. "Sagas and myths," begins one of the latest of these commentators, "everywhere closely linked together in antiquity, form the external limit of the credible history of nations. They magnify the past contests of a nation for independence, narrate the beginnings of one's own people, point out the origin of its customs, portray, often with great copiousness, the family history of ancestors, their services to following generations, and determine their relations to the progenitors of other

tribes. In short, every thing, which a nation in its activity lays claim to, becomes an object in the circle of myths and sagas." Now this system may answer very well in the interpretation of Indian or Chinese antiquity. Nothing may be more beautiful or coherent than such a theory applied to the early Roman legends. In that case, an historical fact may be embellished with a thousand fabulous ornaments, or a mere conception of the mind may have clothed itself in the form of history. But is it right to transfer this ingenious exegesis to the narratives of Moses? Do not the numerous pagan legends presuppose *one* system which was true, and of which they are, more or less, perversions or anomalous excrescences. And are not the earliest remains of Hebrew antiquity essentially different, in certain marks of trustworthiness, from those of pagan origin? Yet, however diverse the Greek mythology is from the Hebrew patriarchal narratives, one and the same system of interpretation has been employed in both. The cosmogony of Moses, and the flood of Noah, have been judged by the same principles as have been applied to the theory of the creation sung by Ovid, or to the deluge of Deucalion. The book of Genesis is regarded by many as a poetic account of the origin of the human race.

The only remaining cause of this general scepticism, which we shall mention, is the influence of two celebrated men, Wolf and Niebuhr,—an influence which, for a time, pervaded more or less every department of literature. Though a considerable interval elapsed between the appearance of Wolf and that of the Roman historian, yet they may here be considered together. The former tried to break down, with his iron mace, the integrity of the Iliad; the latter, after demolishing Livy's beautiful fabric in re-

spect to the early history of Rome, attempted to reconstruct it on a more solid basis. "When Wolf came forward," says Tholuck, "with the hypothesis which has made him immortal, many great philologists shook their heads, not only in cautious Holland and stable England, but in volatile France; and a Villoison spoke even of a *literary impiety:* yet in Germany there arose, among the great spirits, — a Herder, a Heyne, — only the envious dispute, who was authorized to claim for himself, with greater right than Wolf, the honor of the first discovery." * The sensation which Niebuhr's History created was hardly less. Some apprehended, that the author would next apply his searching criticism, with similar results, to the Hebrew records. In addition to extensive and profound learning and great ingenuity, which no one would hesitate to ascribe to these remarkable men, both possessed some of the rare attributes of genius. Erudition or acuteness merely, though unmatched, could never have produced the impression which followed the publication of their writings. †

As a natural result, the eye of an unsparing criticism was immediately turned upon many of the relics of ancient times. Wolf himself cast his penetrating glance upon the Orations of Cicero, and declared in respect to four, "that Cicero could never have written them, sleeping or waking." ‡ Many inferior men followed in the course marked

---

* Die Glaubwürdigkeit, p. 119.

† "Bei Niebuhr war Denken, Fühlen, und Handeln stets vereinigt." — *Von Savigny.*

‡ Weiske, in the Preface to his Commentary on the Oration for Marcellus, showed the spuriousness of Wolf's production on the same grounds by which Wolf attempted to prove the spuriousness of the Oration.

out by Wolf, some of them carrying the principles of their leader much further than his sound judgment would have conducted him. Discredit or contempt was heaped upon some of the most valuable remains of antiquity. The Father of History was spoken of as a garrulous story-teller, equally pleasing to children and to decrepit age. The genuineness of some of the most undoubted Dialogues of Plato was called in question by Schleiermacher and Ast. Socher went still further, and proscribed a large portion of the philosopher's remains. Even Thucydides did not wholly escape this lynx-eyed, yet narrow, criticism.

In these circumstances, the Hebrew writers, and the Pentateuch particularly, would come under special condemnation; because, among other reasons, its professed writer, like Livy, wrote many centuries after the occurrence of some of the principal events which he describes. If suspicions could be cast upon the Gospel of Luke and the First Epistle to Timothy, much less could the earliest Hebrew records be expected to escape the ordeal. Vater, De Wette, and others, followed, on sacred ground, the example which Wolf had set them on classical.

But these days have happily passed, even in Germany. An undistinguishing scepticism is not now considered the fairest evidence of scholarship. Merciless criticism is no longer viewed as the surest test of philological ability. The widest and profoundest investigations are found to be perfectly consistent with an increasing respect for the monuments of antiquity. It is pertinent to our object to advert to a few facts which indicate a return to a sounder and more healthful criticism.

It is difficult to state the exact truth in regard to the opinion which is now entertained of Wolf and his famous

theory. That his writings and lectures contributed to modify somewhat, where they did not subvert, the current belief in relation to the Homeric poems, there can be no doubt; yet his influence has long been on the wane. The enthusiasm, with which his hypothesis was once greeted, no longer exists. More than twenty-five years ago, Professor Welcker, of Bonn, took decided ground against it. At the same period, also, the celebrated Voss wholly dissented, as he informed Welcker in private.* Subsequently came out, in direct opposition to Wolf, the "Historia Homeri," by Nitzsch, of Kiel, — a book distinguished by acuteness, learning, and sound judgment. The "Schul-Zeitung," of August, 1829, remarks, that "*some* yet hold fast to Wolf's paradoxes." A like opinion in respect to the decline of the Wolfian hypothesis has been expressed by Professors Poppo and Klotz. We should not err, perhaps, in affirming, that the older philologists, some of them the pupils of Wolf, still adhere to his theory, or to something akin to it. The younger scholars, many of them among the ablest philologists in Germany, have broken away from its bonds, and have adopted, more or less, the views advocated by Nitzsch. Wolf's attack on some of the Orations of Cicero has only contributed more triumphantly to establish their genuineness. The latest investigations have proved, that the great critic could "sometimes sleep," as well as the great poet. Stallbaum has triumphantly vindicated the authenticity of a number of Plato's Dialogues against the objections of Schleiermacher and Ast. K. F. Hermann, of Göttingen,† speaks with contempt of "the prison-walls which the sub-

* Der Epische Cyclus, Vorrede, p. 8.

† Review of Stallbaum's edition of the Phædrus, in Jahn's Jahrbücher, 1831.

jective, scheming, hair-splitting acuteness of that dialectician [Schleiermacher] built as a dwelling for Plato's spirit." "Many essential passages of Plato," continues Hermann, "were rejected by Schleiermacher, because he did not know how to employ them in support of his own theory."

Abundant and decisive testimonies may be adduced in regard to the high estimation in which Herodotus is now held. Professor Ritter, the celebrated geographer, affirms, that, "of all the records of ancient times, none are receiving more confirmation from modern researches in geography, archæology, and kindred studies, than the tenth chapter of Genesis and the writings of old Herodotus." Schaff remarks, that "the accuracy of Herodotus, often assailed, is more and more confirmed by modern investigations." * Wachler observes: "As the father of geography and history, Herodotus is held in merited and increasing respect; his fidelity and accuracy are confirmed by all the investigations of modern scholars, and defended against the doubts that have been rashly thrown out." † Eichwald, in his Geography of the Caspian Sea, a work of high authority, remarks: "It is with reason that we are surprised both in respect to Herodotus's fidelity and love of truth, and his extensive geographical knowledge; this was, for the most part, the fruit of personal inquiry. Very remarkable is the exact knowledge which he possessed of the eastern shore of the Caspian, and of the particular tribes dwelling there. It may, perhaps, be assumed, that he had a more precise acquaintance with it, than was possessed by us in the last century, or in some respects even now"; — "a position,"

* Encyclopædia, fourth edition, by Hormann and Schinke, 1837, I. p. 37.

† Literaturgeschichte, I. p. 141.

says Bähr, the editor of Herodotus, "which will hold equally good, as we are fully convinced, of several other countries, e. g. the interior of Africa." * "Credibility and love of truth," says Bähr, "can be ascribed to scarcely any historical writer of Greece in a higher degree than to Herodotus, whom one may rightly name in this respect the Father of History." "From several very recent books of travels, especially those of Englishmen, surprising explanations have been obtained of particular parts of the history of Herodotus, and some doubtful or dark places now appear in a true light." "How many things are found even now, after the lapse of thousands of years, just as the Father of History saw and described them!" †

The credibility of Arrian, in the "Expedition of Alexander," has been fully recognized by Droysen, his latest editor. "As an historical writer, by his careful investigation and impartial criticism, he occupies an important place among the Greek historians in general, while of those who have written on Alexander, as Photius already judged, he has, undoubtedly, the first place." ‡

We might adduce many other testimonies to the same effect in relation to several of the Greek and Roman historians, but it is perhaps unnecessary. Those already referred to show clearly enough, that the tone of confident scepti-

---

* Review of Eichwald's "Alte Geographie des Kaspischen Meeres," by Bähr, in Jahn's Jahrbücher, XXIII. p. 153. "This geography," says Bähr, "has furnished a new and splendid demonstration of the veracity, credibility, and fidelity of Herodotus."

† Bähr in Jahn, XVI. p. 326; XI. p. 435. Plutarch doubts the authenticity of Herodotus, because some of his representations are not sufficiently favorable to the Greeks.

‡ Sintenis in Jahn, XVI. p. 132.

cism, which is now indulged by some in this country in respect to the Hebrew Scriptures, has no counterpart in the spirit and method with which the study of classical philology is pursued by the ablest scholars of the present day. This result is not owing to the less profound nature of the investigations. The whole circle of classical literature was never so thoroughly understood as it is at the present time.

We may add, that there are some indications of a return, in Germany, to a better temper of mind and a fairer style of criticism in respect to the Old Testament. It was the remark of Gesenius, that the older he grew, the more he was inclined to return in very many cases to the received methods of interpretation; and the later numbers of his Thesaurus furnish abundant testimony to the sincerity of his declaration.* In his recent writings, he expresses more doubt in relation to the theory, which he once fully adopted, of the late origin of the Pentateuch.

The younger Rosenmüller found occasion, in a number of instances, to renounce the sceptical views which he advocated in some of his earlier works. Even De Wette, in the last edition of his Introduction to the Old Testament, assigns an earlier origin to the Pentateuch than he supported in the former editions. The general current in Germany, among those who deny the Mosaic authorship of the five books, seems to be setting in the same direction. One of the latest and ablest commentators on the book of Job, Professor Stickel of Göttingen, has vindicated the speeches of Elihu as an integral part of the book of Job, — a portion of it which Ewald and others had rejected. The integrity

* Bibliotheca Sacra, May, 1843, p. 375.

of Zechariah is at length admitted by De Wette, though with evident reluctance.

Every fresh examination of the topography and geography of places, described or alluded to in the Pentateuch, shows that the writer had that exact local information which could proceed only from personal observation. "The Old Testament," says Legh, "is beyond all comparison the most interesting and instructive guide of which a traveller in the East can avail himself." * "Wherever any fact is mentioned in the Bible history," says Wilkinson, "we do not discover any thing on the monuments which tends to contradict it." † These and similar facts have led such unprejudiced historians and writers as Ritter, Heeren, Leo, Schlösser, Luden, Ideler, Wachler, and others, to recognize the books of Moses as authentic history. The principal facts of the Pentateuch are acknowledged by Heeren, in his "History of Antiquity," to be historically established. John von Müller says of the tenth chapter of Genesis, that "the data are, geographically, altogether true. From this chapter universal history ought to begin." "The record of God's miraculous Providence," says Luden, in his History of Antiquity, "in regard to the Israelites, *the oldest monument of written history*, did not preserve the people faithful towards God." "We have come to the decided conviction," remarks Leo, "after examining what has been lately written on this subject, that the essential parts of the law, as well as a great portion of the historical accounts, which form the groundwork of the Pentateuch, and cannot be entirely separated from the laws, as they show their im-

* Von Raumer's Palæstina, p. 2, where similar testimony from other travellers is quoted.

† Ancient Egyptians, I. 34.

port and design, were written by Moses himself, and that the collecting the whole into one body, if not done by Moses himself, certainly took place soon after his time, perhaps during his life, and under his own eye." *

III. Credibility of the Jewish Historians.

Our next position is, that greater credit is due to the Hebrew writers, when describing matters pertaining to Jewish history, than to Greek and Roman authors who have adverted to or delineated the same events. In the first place, the Jewish historians lived, for the most part, at or near the periods when the events which they describe occurred. Moses was the leading actor in the scenes which he professes to portray. The last four books of the Pentateuch, in a very important sense, are the memoirs of his own life. Ezra, Nehemiah, and Daniel were eyewitnesses of the events and matters which they narrate. The prophets are historians of the periods in which they lived. They deserve, therefore, more confidence than foreign writers, who flourished centuries afterwards. We attach authority to Herodotus or Tacitus in proportion to the proximity of their lives to the events which they portray.

Again, the Hebrew writers were members of the community whose actions they record; actual residents in the countries and cities respecting which they give information. Moses was educated in the Egyptian court. He lived many years in the wilderness, and became, doubtless, intimately conversant with the whole Arabian peninsula. He does not take up his geographical notices at hearsay. The objects

* Hengstenberg, Beiträge zur Einl. d. Alte Test., I. Prolegomena, pp. 28 - 35; also Bibl. Repos., April, 1838, pp. 440 - 448.

which he describes he did not see with the hasty glance of a traveller, but with the practised eye of a native. So with other Biblical writers. The author of the book of Job writes with the sure hand of one who had ocular proof. The scene of his poem is perfectly familiar to him. Moses does not speak of Egypt in the manner of Pythagoras or Plato, who saw the country only as travellers or temporary residents. Daniel does not write, respecting Babylon, in the manner of a Greek historian, who might have accompanied the expedition of the younger Cyrus. He professes to have lived, during the greater part of a century, in the metropolis, engaged in an employment, which would necessarily lay open to him every source of information. On the other hand, Xenophon and Diodorus Siculus lived hundreds or thousands of miles from scenes and events which they describe. They may have been observing travellers, but they could not narrate the affairs of the Assyrians as they might do those of the Athenians or Sicilians. The journal of a tourist is no adequate substitute for the knowledge which is obtained from half a century's residence in a country or city.

In the third place, some of the principal classical writers were strongly prejudiced against the Jews. The early Greek writers seem to have known or cared little for the descendants of Abraham. The literary community at Athens, though excessively fond of novelties, seem to have been wholly ignorant of the Jews, or else to have held them in profound contempt. We wonder that Herodotus, with his liberal mind, and his passion for extensive researches, did not devote part of a chapter to a land crowded with so many interesting objects as Palestine. We wonder still more, that men of the comprehensive views and philosophical liberality of Plato and Aristotle did not think it worth while

to look into the laws and institutions of Moses. The entire silence of such writers argues either total ignorance of what was occurring in Palestine, or a contempt for its inhabitants unworthy of men of their pretensions.

Essentially similar is the impression which we receive from the Roman writers. Cicero, throughout his multifarious writings, makes no mention, we believe, of the Jews. The poets allude to them in a few instances, to point a jeer or round a period. Thus Juvenal :

> "The laws of Rome those blinded bigots slight,
> In superstitious dread of Jewish rite ;
> To Moses and his mystic volume true," etc.

So remarkable is a paragraph relating to the Jews in the pages of the philosophic Tacitus, that we are tempted to give the substance of it. It is found in the fifth book of his History.

"According to some, the Jews, fleeing from the island of Crete, found an abode in the most distant parts of Libya, at the time that Saturn was violently dethroned by Jupiter. A proof is obtained from the name. There is a celebrated mountain in Crete called Ida ; the inhabitants are termed Idæi, and, by a barbarous enlargement of the word, Judæi. Others report, that, in the reign of Isis, a multitude, pouring forth from Egypt, removed into the contiguous territories, under the lead of Hierosolymus and Judas. Most maintain that they are descended from the Ethiopians, who, compelled by fear and hatred of their king, Cepheus, changed their habitation. Others relate, that an Assyrian mixed population, being destitute of land, took possession of a part of Egypt, and by and by inhabited Hebrew cities and territories as their own right, and then the neighboring parts of Syria. Others give a distinguished origin to the Jews. The

Solymi, a people celebrated in the poems of Homer, founded the city Jerusalem, and called it from their own name."

And this is from the calm, careful, and reflecting Tacitus, written after the Jewish nation had been in existence almost two thousand years; after the country had become a Roman province; when Rome was filled with Jews; and when, by a few minutes' walk, he could have found the true account of the origin of the Jews in the Antiquities of Josephus, or, perhaps, heard it from that author's own mouth. From these legends related by Tacitus, we learn that a profound historian might neglect with impunity to obtain accurate information in respect to a people so despicable as the Jews; and we may also see what vague and unsatisfactory stories then prevailed throughout the civilized world in regard to the history of the Hebrews.

These facts show with sufficient clearness, that some of the Greek and Roman writers were altogether ignorant of the true origin and condition of the Hebrews, while others looked upon them with prejudice and contempt. Why, then, should we prefer these historians as authorities to the Hebrew writers, when the affairs of the Jews are in question? Yet this has been the prevailing habit. Diodorus is put first, Moses second. If Manetho corroborates the lawgiver, well; if not, then the pagan must be set up as the standard. If Daniel's chronology does not agree with that of Abydenus, then the Hebrew is pronounced to be in error, and an additional proof is supposed to be furnished against the authenticity of his prophecies.

IV. Early Origin of Alphabetic Writing.

It has often been alleged as an argument against the genuineness of the Pentateuch, that alphabetic writing did not

exist at the time of Moses, or, if it had been discovered, the knowledge of it was very limited, much too limited to admit of the existence and use of such a book as the Pentateuch.

That alphabetic writing, however, did exist at or before the age of Moses, i. e. 1500 B. C., is capable of proof from a great variety of considerations. If each of the following positions does not of itself establish the fact, yet all, taken together, can leave no reasonable doubt on the subject.

1. So far as there is any evidence from tradition, it is in favor of the very early discovery of alphabetic writing.* The traditions of all the nations of antiquity coincide in this, that the art of writing belonged to the origin of the human race, or to the founders of particular nations. "Several kinds of alphabetical writing were in existence in Asia," says William von Humboldt, "in the earliest times." The Egyptians attribute the discovery of alphabetic writing to Thaaut; the Chaldeans, to Oannes, Memnon, or Hermes; many of the Greeks, to Cecrops, who probably came from Egypt; some, to Orpheus; others, to Linus; Æschylus assigns it to Prometheus; and Euripides, to Palemedes, the Argive. All these are witnesses, that the discovery reached beyond the commencement of history, so that Pliny remarks, not without reason, *ex quo apparet æternus literarum usus.*

2. It will hold good as a general fact, that the most useful arts would be first invented or discovered. Such as are necessary to the support of human life, those which man's inward or outward necessities would first crave, would, in general, be the first that would be originated. Necessity deeply felt is the mother of art. Feelings of joy or sorrow,

* Hengstenberg, Beiträge, I. p. 425.

common to man, and which require for their full expression some outward symbol, or some auxiliary accompaniment, would necessarily lead to the invention of musical instruments. Some of the more important uses of iron would be early found out, because any degree of civilization, or even of comfort, would be hardly conceivable without it. The violent passions which agitate man would early lead him to invent armor, defensive and offensive. Journeys or marches would be impossible for any considerable distance, without means for crossing deep rivers and narrow seas. Civilization, in any proper sense of that word, would imply a considerable knowledge of house architecture; if not of such contrivances as chimneys and glass windows, yet of some substitute for them.

Now, we can conceive of few things more necessary, where there was any degree of refinement, where the sciences were at all cultivated, or where there was any measure of commercial activity, than the art of writing. A patriarch burying a beloved wife among strangers, in a strange land, would feel desirous to erect something more than a heap of stones, and to affix something more than a rude portrait or hieroglyphic. He would wish to write her name on the rock for ever. Among all nations, particularly the Oriental, there is a strong disposition for constructing and handing down genealogical tables and family registers. The practice has its origin in one of the deepest feelings of our nature. Yet this would be hardly possible in the absence of an alphabet. A long list of proper names might be engraven on the memory of a single person. But how could it thus be accurately propagated through a number of centuries? We have abundant proof that the Chaldeans were early engaged in some kind of astronomical calcula-

tions. But how could these be carried on without the use of letters or figures? And would this skill in astronomy be any less difficult than the invention of an alphabet? Would it not be much further from the wants of common life? Again, we learn, from many unquestionable sources, that the Phœnicians were, in very early times, engaged in an extensive commerce, embracing at least all the shores and the principal islands of the Mediterranean. Now these marine adventures presuppose a sufficient degree of activity of mind in the Phœnicians to invent an alphabetic system, if they did not before possess one. Besides, how extremely difficult, if not impossible, to conduct an extensive system of barter, to transport into distant regions a great variety of goods, as we know the Phœnicians did, to commission agencies, or something equivalent to them, and to carry home the proceeds or the exchanged articles, and distribute them to a variety of owners, without any written record whatever, in dependence merely on the memory, or on some rude visible signs! For these purposes, no Mexican painting or Chaldean symbols would be sufficient. The Egyptian hieroglyphics did not render a contemporaneous alphabetic writing unnecessary. For some of the most important purposes of a civilized people, hardly any invention could be more clumsy than the hieroglyphics. How could the deed of a piece of land, the forms and inflections of grammar, thousands of foreign names and terms, and the numerous commercial and statistical details which would be indispensable in a kingdom like Egypt, be expressed by pictures, — by the representations of visible objects, however ingenious?

3. The perception of historical truth exists in such close connection with the knowledge and extension of the art of

writing, that where the latter is wanting, the former is never found, not even among those nations which have certain elements of it.* This is strikingly illustrated by the example of the Arabians before the age of Mohammed. All which we know of their history, says De Sacy, was found in the midst of oral traditions, and showed everywhere that entire lack of chronological order, that mixture of fables and marvels, which characterize the period when a nation has no other historians than the poets, and no other archives than the memory of succeeding generations. Now, the Pentateuch, according to the unanimous opinion of men engaged in the same department of literature, — the historians, with whom, to a certain extent, agree the most prejudiced among the theologians, — has a truly historical character. In this respect, it is totally unlike the Arabian traditions referred to. It may be said, indeed, that the Pentateuch was composed at a period much later than the time of Moses, and thus acquired its historical character when the art of writing was generally practised by the Israelites. But, according to the theory generally entertained by those who hold to the late origin of the Pentateuch as a whole, there are fragments, portions larger or smaller, which must have been written at or before the time of Moses. Now these fragments have the genuine historical stamp, as clearly as the supposed later portions; and in them, also, are references to historical works, like the "Book of the Wars of the Lord," which have perished.

4. The theory of the early discovery of the art of writing derives strong confirmation from the fact of the very high antiquity of many of the arts in Egypt, and especially

---

* Hengstenberg's Authentie, I. 409.

of such as are necessary to the art of writing. If arts, requiring great skill and strong powers of invention, were in use at a very early period, then we may suppose, that the art of writing, requiring no higher, perhaps not so high, powers of invention, might have been discovered.

"We have been enabled," says Sir J. G. Wilkinson, "to fix, with a sufficient degree of precision, the bondage of the Israelites and the arrival of Joseph; and, though these events took place at an age when nations are generally supposed to have been in their infancy, and in a state of barbarism, yet we perceive, that the Egyptians had then arrived at as perfect a degree of civilization as at any subsequent period of their history. They had the same arts, the same manners and customs, the same style of architecture, and were in the same advanced state of refinement, as in the reign of Rameses II. The most remote point to which we can see opens with a nation possessing all the arts of civilized life already matured. The same customs and inventions that prevailed in the Augustan age of that people, after the accession of the eighteenth dynasty, are found in the remote age of Osirtasen I.; and there is no doubt that they were in the same civilized state when Abraham visited the country." * Many obelisks, each of a single block of granite, had been hewn and transported twelve miles, from the quarries at the cataracts of Syene, as early at least as the time of Joseph; and the same mechanical skill had already existed even before that period, as is shown from the construction of the pyramids near Memphis, which, in the size of the blocks and the style of build-

* Wilkinson, Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians, 2d ed., Vol. I. Preface; Vol. III. p. 260.

ing, evince a degree of architectural knowledge, perhaps inferior to none possessed at a subsequent period. The wonderful skill the Egyptians evinced in sculpturing or engraving hard stones,* is still more surprising than their ability to hew and transport blocks of granite. We wonder at the means employed for cutting hieroglyphics, frequently to the depth of more than two inches, on basalt, or sienite, and other stones of the hardest quality. Their taste, too, was not deficient in originality, while it is universally allowed to have been the parent of much that was afterwards perfected with such wonderful success by the ancient Greeks.†

The Egyptians appear to have been acquainted with glass-blowing as early as the reign of Osirtasen I., 1700 B. C. The process is represented in the paintings of Beni Hassan, executed during the reign of that monarch and his immediate successors. A bead, bearing a king's name who lived 1500 B. C., has been found at Thebes, the specific gravity of which is precisely the same as that of crown glass now manufactured in England. Glass vases, for holding wine, appear to have been used as early as the Exodus. The colors of some Egyptian opaque glass not only present the most varied devices on the exterior, but the same hue and the same device pass, in right lines, directly through the substance; so that in whatever part it is broken, or wherever a section may chance to be made of it, the same appearance, the same colors, and the same device, present themselves, without any deviation from the direc-

* "To devise cunning works, to work in gold, and in silver, and in brass, and in cutting of stones to set them," etc. — Ex. xxxi. 4, 5.

† Wilkinson, III. 85.

tion of a straight line, — a mode of workmanship which Europeans are still unable to imitate.

"It is not from the Scriptures alone that the skill of the Egyptian goldsmiths may be inferred; the sculptures of Thebes and Beni Hassan afford their additional testimony; and the numerous gold and silver vases, inlaid-work and jewelry, represented in common use, show the great advancement they had already made, at a remote period, in this branch of art. The engraving of gold, the mode of casting it, and inlaying it with stones,* were evidently known at the same time; numerous specimens of this kind of work have been found in Egypt." †

The ornaments in gold, found in that country, consist of rings, bracelets, armlets, necklaces, ear-rings, and numerous trinkets belonging to the toilet; many of which are of the early times of Osirtasen I. and Thothmes III., the contemporaries of Joseph and of Moses. Gold and silver vases, statues, and other objects of gold and silver, of silver inlaid with gold, and of bronze inlaid with the precious metals, were also common at the same time. Substances of various kinds were overlaid with fine gold-leaf, at the earliest periods of which the monuments remain, even in the time of Osirtasen I.‡ Silver rings have been found of the age of Thothmes III. The paintings of Thebes frequently represent persons in the act of weighing gold on the purchase of articles in the market. The arch of brick existed as early as the reign of Amunoph I., 1540 B. C. It would

* "Aaron fashioned it with a graving tool, after he had made it a molten calf." — Ex. xxxii. 4.

† Wilkinson, III. 223.

‡ The ark of acacia-wood, made by Moses, was overlaid with pure gold. Ex. xxv. 11, 12.

appear from the paintings at Beni Hassan, that vaulted buildings were constructed as early as the time of Joseph. Harps of fourteen and lyres of seventeen strings are found to have been used by the ordinary Egyptian musicians, in the reign of Amosis, about 1500 B. C. "Stone-workers were accustomed," says Rosellini, "to engrave upon each square block an inscription in hieroglyphics; an impression was made upon the bricks, which besides, very frequently, bore inscriptions; even oxen were represented; the steward of the house kept a written register. They probably wrote more in ancient Egypt, and on more ordinary occasions, than among us." "The Egyptians," says the same author, "differ specially from all other people, in that they constantly cover the interior and exterior of their houses, and the walls of all the innumerable apartments of their subterranean burial-places, with images and writings." *

In the infancy of society, various materials were employed for writing, as stones, bricks, tiles, plates of bronze, lead, and other metals, wooden tablets, the leaves and bark of trees, and the shoulder-bones of animals.†

The Egyptians were not less celebrated for their manufacture of paper, than for the delicate texture of their linen. The plant from which it was made, the papyrus, mostly grew in Lower Egypt. "Pliny is greatly in error," says

---

* Robbins's Translation of Hengstenberg's Egypt and the Books of Moses, p. 89.

† The Korân, which much exceeds the Pentateuch in extent, was first inscribed on the most inconvenient materials. Fragments of it written in the time of Mohammed, and subsequently incorporated into the work, were written not only on pieces of skin or parchment, but to a greater extent on leaves of the palm, on white and flat stones, on bones, such as shoulder-blades and ribs.

Wilkinson, "when he supposes that the papyrus was not used for making paper before the time of Alexander the Great, since we meet with papyri of the most remote Pharaonic periods; and the same mode of writing on them is shown, from the sculptures, to have been common in the age of Suphis or Cheops, the builder of the great pyramid, more than two thousand years before our era." *

From the facts above quoted, and which might be greatly enlarged, all antecedent improbability in respect to the discovery of the art of writing is taken away. Rather, the contemporaneous existence of an art so necessary is strongly presupposed.†

---

* Wilkinson, III. 149, 150.

† The question may possibly be asked, How can the very early existence of the arts in Egypt be asserted so positively? On what grounds can the exact period of the existence of a particular art be assumed? In other words, On what do the hieroglyphical discoveries rest? One answer is, that all who have examined the monuments, in accordance with the method of deciphering the hieroglyphics discovered by Young and Champollion, are substantially agreed. Coincidence of views in men, differing in many respects so widely, as is the case with Young, Champollion, Salvolini, Gesenius, Rosellini, Lepsius, Prudhoe, Wilkinson, Letronne, Leemans, and many others, is satisfactory proof of the correctness of the results to which they have arrived. Examinations so thorough and long-continued, by men so competent, taken in connection with the almost perfect preservation of many of the paintings and monuments, justify the confidence which is now universally accorded. Another answer is, that the results of the deciphering agree substantially with the notices respecting the subject in Diodorus, Herodotus, Manetho, Clement, etc. The monuments, in many essential points, confirm the historians. There is often a circumstantial agreement in a number of independent witnesses. Between the Bible and the monuments no instance of contradiction has yet been found. Among the Biblical proper names found on the monuments are לוּדִים, פּוּל, כּוּשׁ, תִּרְהָקָה, נֹא־אָמוֹן, מֹף or נֹף, מְגִדּוֹ, שִׁישַׁק, נַהֲרַיִם,

5. Letters were introduced into Greece from Phœnicia, and at a very early period. In respect to the first of these positions, there is no longer any doubt. The claims of the Phœnicians rest, not only on historical notices, but on the essential unity which appears in the names and forms of the Oriental and Greek letters. "That the Greeks," says Professor Boeckh, "received their alphabetic writing from the Phœnicians, is an undeniable fact." *

In proof of the very early existence of alphabetic writing among the Greeks, the following considerations may be adduced. Even those, who deny that Homer practised the art of writing, allow that it was introduced into Greece at an early time. F. A. Wolf even remarks, that the introduction of the art of writing at a very early period may be safely concluded from the testimony of Herodotus.† O. Müller says, that the art was practised several hundred years before Solon.

The oldest inscriptions reach back between 600 and 700 B. C. But these inscriptions imply a previous knowledge of reading somewhat extended; and it may be that letters and the materials of writing were in the hands of a caste long before the earliest inscriptions which have come down to us. The existence of such a learned caste in other countries renders this probable. And it ought ever to be remembered, that there is not one chance in a hundred that our earliest inscriptions are actually the earliest.

כַּחֲנַיִם, בֵּית חֹרוֹן, פָּרַס, נִינְוֵה, etc. See Halle Lit. Zeit., May, 1839, p. 21.

* Metrologische Untersuchungen, 1838, p. 41.

† Wolf maintains that it was impossible, even for the poets themselves, without the aid of writing, to project and retain in their memory poems of such an extent as the Iliad.

It would not be relevant to go at large into the question, whether the author of the Homeric poems made use of writing, yet it may be well to advert to it briefly. We have names and some fragments of epic poets who go back as far as to the commencement of the Olympiads, about 780 or 800 B. C., and who, it was never pretended, delivered their poems orally. Why should Homer be torn from their company, if it can be shown that he did not live more than a century, or a century and a half, before them?

Again, there are two or three allusions in the Iliad itself, which, to say the least, are most naturally interpreted by supposing the contemporaneous use of writing. In lines 166 – 170 of Book VI., it is related, that Bellerophon was sent by the king of Argos to a Lycian king, with a closed tablet, in which the former had traced many deadly signs, *σήματα λυγρά*, that is, had given secret instructions to the Lycian king to destroy the bearer. Did this tablet contain alphabetical characters, or mere pictures? The former is certainly the most simple and reasonable interpretation. But if they were hieroglyphics, it would be evident, as Thirlwall remarks,* that the want of alphabetic writing, which was so felt, and which had been partially supplied by drawing, would soon be met by adopting the Phœnician characters. If the Greeks had no proper alphabet, still this narrative shows that they were fully prepared for it, as they had the idea of communicating intelligence to a distant person by signs.

Again, we learn from innumerable passages in the Homeric poems, that the Phœnicians at that time carried on an active commerce with the Greeks. Homer was himself an

* Thirlwall's Greece, I. p. 108, Harpers' ed.

Asiatic Greek, or a native of an island near the Asiatic shore. As we know that the Phœnicians practised writing before his time, is it conceivable, that the inquisitive Greeks would remain in ignorance of a discovery so useful, or that Homer's universal genius would not obtain a hint of an art from innumerable voyagers and travellers, whom he must have seen, whom he well knew, and who practised an art which was in general use two or three hundred miles from his own home, probably on the same coast?

There are many things in these poems, which, to say the least, it would be nearly impracticable to hand down through successive generations by the memory in its utmost perfection. A catalogue of ships occupies half of the second book of the Iliad. Supposing that parts of it are interpolated, yet it is still a catalogue, a lexicon of countries, cities, towns, — nearly all the geography and topography of Greece. There are the names of leaders, often with their genealogies, wives, children, and finally a list of more than thirteen hundred ships. To this is to be added all the commanders and allies of Troy, and a geographical summary of their native countries and cities. Could such things be safely trusted to the memory? Is the memory tenacious of long lists of dry names and facts?*

Again, notwithstanding all which has been ingeniously urged on the opposite side, there is a manifest unity of plan, and a higher unity of feeling and action, in the Iliad.† If this is the case, then the Iliad must have come down to us, in its most essential parts, as it proceeded from the soul of the author. It is hardly conceivable that a series of

* Hug, Erfindung d. Buchstabenschrift, p. 90.

† O. Müller rejects the opinion of those who would separate the Iliad and Odyssey into parts, as *altogether antiquated.*

later poets could have so entered into the mind of the author, as to develop that inward, living germ which the poem certainly possesses. There is a bare possibility that portions of the Paradise Lost were not from the pen of Milton. Yet it would require some degree of hardihood positively to affirm what is directly in face of the unity of the poem. The products of a great genius are not of that loose and uncertain character. The original, organic connection must be destroyed by later interpolating poets. In the case of Homer, too, it must be supposed that these later poets were men of equal genius, which would certainly be a most extraordinary phenomenon.

Here, then, are two poems, containing, after all interpolations are removed, twenty-five or thirty thousand lines, exhibiting a symmetry of parts, a unity of plan more or less developed, and all animated by the spirit of sweet simplicity, genuine nature, and also by the highest sublimity. Is it reasonable to suppose that there were a number of authors? Is it reasonable to imagine, is it not rather incredible, that the author could have transmitted these poems without the aid of writing materials? We may conceive, possibly, that they could be transmitted from the second person or generation to the third, and so on, without such aid. But in the *first* instance, they must have been committed to something more firm than man's treacherous memory. The process of composing a poem of fifteen thousand or of ten thousand lines, according to a regular plan, the various parts more or less cohering together, with thousands of proper names, and all without the aid of writing materials, would seem to involve an impossibility on the very face of it. At all events, it is far less simple, and is encom-

passed with much more formidable difficulties, than the old and common theory.*

6. We now proceed to show by direct proof, that alphabetic writing did exist, and was extensively employed, at or before the time of Moses. It will be most satisfactory to state the evidence in the language of those, who, as all will acknowledge, are the best qualified to judge on this subject. Most of the writers whom we shall quote are far from entertaining undue respect for the word of God. A number of them are leading rationalists, who deny altogether that Moses was the author of the Pentateuch. Accordingly, their testimony must be regarded as specially valuable, for Moses could not have been the author of the books which are attributed to him, if alphabetic writing was then unknown. Into the particular theories of the writers in regard to the countries where writing had its origin, the mode of its extension, etc., it is not necessary here to inquire. No apology will be necessary for the introduction of a few facts and allusions, not specially bearing on the main object which we have in view. We begin with Gesenius. The passage is found in an appendix to the last edition of his Hebrew Grammar, published a short time before his death.

"In order to understand the names and forms of the Hebrew letters, recourse must be had to the Phœnician alpha-

* The same course of argument may be applied to the Pentateuch. There are various passages in it, as the exact census, Numb. ii., and the itinerary, Numb. xxxiii., for which the memory would be a very unsafe depository. There are, also, throughout the book, marks of one controlling mind, unity of plan and design. So far as this concinnity of the different portions can be proved, so far is it shown to be necessary for the author to have possessed writing materials.

bet, the parent of all the alphabets of Western Asia and Europe. In this the forms of the twenty-two letters are still pictures, more or less manifest, of sensible objects, the names of which begin with these letters, while the names of the letters denote those objects.

"Accordingly, the Phœnician alphabet was developed from a hieroglyphic writing, and in such a manner that the characters no longer denote, as was the case in the hieroglyphics, the represented objects themselves, but solely the initial letters of the same. This transition from hieroglyphic to alphabetic writing we find very early among the Egyptians, at least 2000 B. C. [500 years before Moses]. The oldest writing of the Egyptians was solely hieroglyphic. But as this did not provide for the necessities, naturally often arising, to express the *sound* of words also, an ingenious expedient was devised, of causing a number of pictures to denote merely the initial sound of the word indicated thereby; e. g. the *hand*, *tôt*, was assumed for *t;* the *mouth*, *ṛo*, for *r*. So the alphabetic writing was originated, which the ancient Egyptians used in constant connection with the hieroglyphic. Along with the latter, which was used on the monuments, and which consists of perfect pictures, the Egyptians had still another mode, though less exact, to express objects of common life, in which the pictures were often so abridged as to be indistinct, consisting only of rough elementary strokes.

"In accordance with these historical premises, it is in the highest degree probable, that some Phœnician, connected in very ancient times with the neighboring Egyptians, invented his own alphabet, new and altogether more convenient and practical. Rejecting entirely the hieroglyphics and their innumerable characters, he selected simply twenty-two signs for the twenty-two consonant sounds of his language."

"To determine the time and place of this discovery, facts are wanting; yet that it was made by the Phœnicians in Egypt, in accordance with its Egyptian type or model, somewhere near the time of the reign of the Shepherd Kings in Egypt, is a very probable supposition." *

"It is remarkable, that the names of so many letters refer to objects of pastoral life; some seem to be of Egyptian origin, at least *Tet*." †

The following passages are from Professor Ewald's latest work.‡

"From a consideration of the Semitic languages, it ap-

---

* The Shepherd Kings, according to Wilkinson and others, conquered Egypt before Joseph was carried captive there. Wilkinson, I. 38.

† On another page, Gesenius remarks, that "the high antiquity of the Hebrew pronouns appears from their most extraordinary agreement with the pronouns of the ancient Egyptian language, by far the oldest of which we possess any written memorials." All the separate pronouns in the Egyptian are compounded of the proper germ of the pronoun and a prefixed syllable, *an*, *ant*, *ent*, which must have given it a demonstrative sense, and served to impart to a short word more power and body. The Hebrew pronouns of the first and second persons have this prefixed syllable, at least *an*. It is not found in the third person, in the Biblical Hebrew, yet it is seen in the Talmudic. The essential pronominal forms in both languages correspond, e. g. Egypt. 3d pers. pl. *sen*, to Heb. *hem*, *hen*. The demonstrative prefixed syllable *an*, *in* (אִן), has a manifest analogy with הִן, *see!* etc. "It now appears to be probable, that between the Hebrew and ancient Egyptian, there was not merely the reciprocal reception of words already formed, but a relationship of stem, lying deeper, and as old at least as that with the Indo-Germanic stock." "The correspondences of the Hebrew with the ancient Egyptian are still more important than with the Coptic." Gesenius's Heb. Gram., 13th edition. Halle Lit. Zeit. 1839, No. 80; 1841, No. 40.

‡ Geschichte des Volkes Israel, 1843, I. p. 68 – 71.

pears that the Asiatic dialects, at least, expressed the simplest ideas in respect to the art of writing in the same manner throughout,* while later improvements in the art could be easily expressed by each in a different way. This phenomenon is not otherwise explainable than as follows. This existing writing was first used, in its simplest application, by an unknown primitive Semitic people; from them it was received, together with the most necessary designations of the object, by all the Semitic tribes known to us in history, just as certainly as the fact that the term *Elóah*, for *God*, common to all the Semitic nations, shows that already the primitive people from whom they separated designated *God* by this name. Following such traces, we may be led to the most surprising truths, beyond the most distant periods of the history of nations."

"We thus here see how every investigation into the origin of writing among the primitive tribes leads us back to the remotest misty antiquity, to a more exact investigation of which all our present helps are not adequate. Among these tribes, writing is always earlier than we can follow it historically, just as every original art certainly springs from the most direct necessities of life, and may be soonest developed by a people extensively engaged in commerce; its use for the purpose of writing history, or only of fixing laws, lies manifestly very early back. Whatever may have been the primitive Semitic people to whom half of the civ-

* Not only כָּתַב, *to write*, with its many derivatives, is common to all the Semitic languages (perhaps with the exception of the Æthiopic), but also סֵפֶר, *book*, and דְּיוֹ, *ink;* only the instrument for writing must have been early changed, since עֵט and חֶרֶט stand nearly alone, the Syrians using, instead of it, קֻלְמָא, and the Arabians and Ethiopians, together with the later Jews, *κάλαμος*.

ilized world are indebted for this inestimable gift, so much cannot be mistaken, that it appears in history, as a possession of a Semitic people, *long before the time of Moses;* and that Israel had already, before his time, known and employed it in Egypt, can be assumed without difficulty."

"The kindred nations may have had, not only the art of writing, but an historical literature also, earlier than Israel, since, according to all the traces, Israel was among the smallest and latest of the tribes in the series of the larger and earlier developed brother-nations. In our opinion, the notices in respect to Edom, definite and copious as they are given in Gen. xxxvi., bear altogether the marks of having been drawn, by the writer, from older Edomitish sources; then, also, the report in regard to the wisdom of the Edomites must have had some ground. We also call to mind the primitive narration, Gen. xiv. (wholly different from all the other notices), where Abraham is spoken of as a "Hebrew," almost a stranger to the narrator, just as a Canaanitish historian might speak of him. The information incidentally preserved, Numb. xiii. 22, in respect to the time of the building of the early founded cities, Hebron in Canaan and Tanis in Egypt, appears altogether like the fragment of a Phœnician work, or of one not Hebrew."

"Thus it appears to us not only as very probable, but rather certain, that the earliest historians of Israel found already in existence a multitude of historical works of the kindred tribes. That the Tyrians possessed historical books, carefully written, with an exact chronology, we know definitely from fragments of the works of Dios and Menander of Ephesus, which they prepared for the Greeks."

"Thus the position is firmly established, that from the time of Moses Hebrew historical writing could have been developed, and was developed."

Our next extract is from Von Lengerke, a Professor in the University of Königsberg.* "The use of writing and of the easier writing-material, that made of skins, is thus presupposed, by the oldest tradition, to have been in existence at the time of Moses, and there is no sufficient ground to doubt it." "At all events, it appears to be historically proved from their names, e. g. Kirjath Sepher, *city of the book*, etc., that writing was practised by the inhabitants of Canaan, at a very early time, before the return of the Israelites from Egypt." "That the Israelites appropriated to themselves many arts while in Egypt, e. g. the art of weaving, of fusing and working metals, etc , is undeniable ; and probably the like may be concluded of the art of writing, though the discovery of a Semitic alphabet cannot be of Egyptian origin ; still the supposition is probable, that the Egyptian hieroglyphic writing was transformed by the Hyksos (Shepherd Kings) into alphabetic writing, and that this discovery then passed over to the other Semitic tribes." "The Tyrians certainly had an historical literature in the Mosaic era ; for, though the fragments from Dios and Menander of Ephesus do not relate to a time earlier than that of David and Solomon, still we may draw the conclusion from the genuinely historical stamp of these notices, that Phœnician historical writers flourished at a far earlier period."

"The conclusion does not appear hasty," says Professor A. T. Hartmann of Rostock, "that the art of writing, for a long time employed by the Babylonians, passed over to the Phœnicians, as soon as the latter felt their need of it. Now if this was the case, the Phœnicians had learned to use this

* Kenáan. Volks-und Religionsgeschichte Israel's, 1844, Introduction, pp. xxx., xxxi., and p. 374.

invaluable art, certainly at a period which extends far back of Moses and the residence of the Israelites in Egypt." * "Acquaintance with alphabetic writing," says Vater, "on the part of Moses and his contemporaries, is not merely possible, but more than probable." †

"The inscriptions on the Babylonian bricks," says Boeckh,‡ "which are written in a character similar to the Phœnician, exhibit a later form than the oldest Phœnician; yet this by no means proves, that the Phœnician character did not originate in Babylon; for it certainly often happens, that the older form of writing is preserved in a derived alphabet longer than in the original one, as the Italian alphabet, and particularly the Latin, show in relation to the Greek."

"The Egyptians on one side," says Professor Olshausen of Kiel, "the Hebrews and Phœnicians on the other, we find, at a time which extends back of all sure chronology, in possession of an alphabet, which has one and the same extraordinary principle to denote the sound. For this purpose an object was represented or pictured, whose name in the various spoken languages of Egypt or the Semitic tribes, begins with this sound."

"Moses at least was acquainted with the Egyptian writing; he himself could write; from him begin the notices in respect to the practice of the art of writing among the Israelites." ||

It is unnecessary to multiply these references any further. The argument from this source against the genuineness of

* Histor. Krit. Forschungen, 1831, p. 615.

† Vater, quoted by Hengstenberg, Beiträge, I. p. 424.

‡ Metrolog. Untersuch., p. 40.

|| Ueber den Ursprung d. Alphabetes, 1841, pp. 5, 6.

the Pentateuch is wholly untenable, and is generally abandoned in Germany. As, however, it has been recently brought forward with considerable confidence, and as the discussion of it might cast light on other topics which may come under consideration, we have thought it worth while to devote some space to it.

V. The Language and Style of the Pentateuch do not prove its later Origin.

It is confidently affirmed by some in our country, that the Pentateuch must be of comparatively recent origin, from the fact that its language and idiom do not differ from those of the professedly later books. Moses, as is affirmed, wrote six or eight centuries before some of the prophets; there would, therefore, inevitably be many archaisms, or vestiges of antiquity, in the former; but as there are not, then it follows that the writer of the Pentateuch must have been coeval, or nearly so, with the prophets. The similarity, or rather identity, of style in the two cases precludes any other hypothesis. We might with as much reason suppose that the Latin of Ennius, or of the Twelve Tables, would be identical with that of Livy or Tacitus; or that Chaucer and Addison would use the same English vocabulary; as that Moses and Isaiah should be found to differ in style as little as they do. The early origin of the Pentateuch is impossible on this ground alone. We need no other proof that it is not genuine.

It is hardly necessary, perhaps, to undertake to refute this position at length. The opponents of the genuineness of the Pentateuch in Germany have generally, and long ago, abandoned this ground as untenable. Since, however, it is again urged as a decisive objection to the early origin of

the five books of Moses, it may be well to devote a few pages to its examination.

In the first place, it is not true that there are no differences between the language of the Pentateuch and that of the later books. The differences are by no means inconsiderable, as the best Hebrew scholars of the present day acknowledge Ewald, speaking of some fragments of the Pentateuch and Joshua, says that "there are many things in the style as rare as they are antique. Considering the small number of passages, the amount of words elsewhere wholly unknown, or not used in prose, is great." *

The last service which was performed for the cause of sacred learning by Dr. Jahn of Vienna, was an elaborate essay on the language and style of the Pentateuch, designed to vindicate its genuineness. His object was to show that there are a multitude of words in the Pentateuch, which never occur, or very rarely, in the later books; while in the later books there are many words, which are never or but seldom found in the Pentateuch. In his lists, he has omitted most of the ἅπαξ λεγόμενα, also those words, which must from the nature of the case be peculiar to the Pentateuch; e. g. proper names of countries, cities, and nations; the names of particular diseases, such as the leprosy and its symptoms; the various terms which designate blemishes in men, priests, and sacrificial offerings, and those which were employed in the construction of the tabernacle; also the names of those natural objects which are peculiar to Egypt and the Arabian desert. On the other hand, in the list of words peculiar to the later books, those terms are excluded which the author of the Pentateuch had no occasion to use. After the designations

* Geschichte d. Volkes Israel, I. 77.

for all these classes of objects were left out, Jahn then made a selection from the most important of the remainder. This enumeration comprises about *four hundred* words and phrases peculiar to the Pentateuch, or but very seldom employed elsewhere, and about *four hundred* words and phrases in the later books, which either do not occur at all, or but very rarely, in the Pentateuch. Jahn's list, as Hengstenberg remarks, requires a revision, as Hebrew learning has made great progress in the last twenty-five years. Jahn fell into some mistakes in his interpretation of words, and he confined himself too much to their external form. He should also have omitted the *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα*. Yet, after all allowances are made, the greater portion of the words in his enumeration are perfectly in point. Not a few words and phrases to which he makes no allusion might swell the number.

We here adduce a few terms and forms of speech, some of the more important of which Gesenius and Ewald also refer to as peculiar to the Pentateuch.

The words הוּא, *he*, and נַעַר, *young man*, are of common gender, and used, also, for *she* and *young woman*. The former is found in one hundred and ninety-five places, as feminine, in the Pentateuch; neither is found as feminine out of it. "In accordance with the spirit of the language," says Ewald, "and the obviously gradual separation of gender, this is a proof, which cannot be mistaken, in favor of the high antiquity of the Pentateuch." When הוּא stands for הִיא, the punctators give it the appropriate pointing of this form (הֻוא). From this circumstance, it has been suggested as probable, that other original archaisms in the Pentateuch may, in the lapse of ages, have been conformed to later usage.

The plural of the demonstrative pronoun אֵל is found eight times in Genesis, Leviticus, and Deuteronomy, always with the article; elsewhere this form is found but once (there without the article), in 1 Chron. xx. 8, "manifestly borrowed," says Ewald, "from the Pentateuch." In all other places, ה is appended, אֵלֶּה.

The phrase, נֶאֱסַף אֶל־עַמּוֹ, *to be gathered to his people*, is the standing form in the Pentateuch; in the other books it is never found. Instead of it, elsewhere, the phrase, *to sleep with his fathers*, is employed.

The customary designation of *cohabitation* in the Pentateuch by עֶרְוָה גָּלָה, is found elsewhere only in Ezek. xxii. 10, where there is a manifest play upon the words in Lev. xx. 11.

Together with the form כֶּבֶשׂ, *lamb*, the form כֶּשֶׂב is found in the Pentateuch fourteen times; elsewhere never.

מִין, *species*, *kind*, occurs twenty-eight times in the Pentateuch, elsewhere only in Ezek. xlvii. 10, borrowed from Gen. i. 21.

רֵיחַ נִיחוֹחַ, *sweet odor*, used of offerings, occurs four times in the Pentateuch, elsewhere only in Ezekiel, where it is manifestly borrowed from the Pentateuch.

עֲמִית, *neighbor*, in Pentateuch eleven times; elsewhere only in Zech. xiii. 7, manifestly grounded on the usage in the Pentateuch.

For צָחַק, *to laugh*, of the Pentateuch, the other books use שָׂחַק with three exceptions. שָׂחַק is used fifty-two times. The same is true of the exchange of צָעַק for the softer זָעַק. The צ is the hardest of the sibilants. "The general process of modification," says Ewald, "is, that the harder, rougher sounds become more and more exchanged for those which are softer and weaker." Even in the proper name, *Isaac*, שׂ is used for צ in Amos.

שָׂעִיר is used for *goat* fifty times in the Pentateuch ; elsewhere never.

The country on the east of the Jordan, opposite Jericho, has in the Pentateuch the name עַרְבוֹת מוֹאָב, *plains of Moab ;* elsewhere only in Josh. xiii. 22, in reference to the narrative in the Pentateuch. In Judg. xi. 12 seq., where there is a somewhat detailed account of the march of Jephthah into this territory, there is no trace of this name ; it is called *the land of the Amorites.*

The designation of the Jordan, in the neighborhood of Jericho, by יַרְדֵּן יְרֵחוֹ, is found only in the Pentateuch and Joshua.

The phrase, *to cover the eye of the earth*, כָּסָּה אֶת־עֵין הָאָרֶץ, occurs only in the Pentateuch. It is one evidence of the *sensuous* character of the language of the Pentateuch. In later times, such expressions appear only in poetry. It has a parallel in the expression, " as the ox licketh up the grass of the field," Numb. xxii. 4.

The verb קָבַב, *to hollow out*, occurs only in the Pentateuch. In the remaining books, נָקַב is employed, which is also found in the Pentateuch.

נְקֵבָה, *female*, is found twenty-one times in the Pentateuch, elsewhere only in Jer. xxxi. 22, where there is an evident reference to Numb. vi. 30.

פֹּה, *here*, *in this place*, only in the Pentateuch. רַגְלַיִם, in the sense of *times*, literally *beats*, is not found out of the Pentateuch. In the other books, the equivalent, פְּעָמִים, is used, which also appears in the Pentateuch. This peculiarity is not to be regarded as accidental. In ancient times, when visible objects had such preponderance, the connection of the original meaning of a word with its derivatives was so visibly preserved, that every word which

signifies *foot* or *step* might be used, without any addition, in the sense of *times*.

The phrase, בְּנוֹ בְעֹר, Numb. xxiv. 3, 15, *son of Beor*. The ו as the outward mark of the construct state, belongs to the infancy of language. It is peculiar to the Pentateuch, except that it is found in Ps. cxiv. 8, which is an imitation, and in the word חַיְתוֹ, Ps. l. 10; civ. 11; Is. lvi. 9; Zeph. ii. 14, which is copied literally from Gen. i. 24.

שָׁתַם is used in Numbers for the later שָׂתַם and סָתַם.

The words, אֲסַפְסֻם, *mixed multitude*, Numb. xi. 4, and קְלֻקָּל, *vile*, *light*, Numb. xxi. 5, are not found except in the Pentateuch.

אַמְתַּחַת, *sack*, is found fifteen times in Genesis, elsewhere never; אָכוֹן, *hurt*, five times in the Pentateuch, not elsewhere; חָזֶה, *breast of animals*, thirteen times, only in the Pentateuch; חֶרְמֵשׁ, *sickle*, twice in Deuteronomy (מַגָּל is the later word); כָּל־יְקוּם, *every living thing*, only in Gen. and Deut.; מֶכֶס, *portion*, *tribute*, three times, in Numbers only; מִכְסָה, *number*, only in Exod. and Lev.; עָבַךְ, *to be redundant*, nine times, only in the Pentateuch; עִשָּׂרוֹן, *a tenth part*, twenty-six times, only in the Pentateuch; פְּקֵרִי, קֶרִי, *hostile encounter*, seven times, only in the Pentateuch; קָרַן, *to emit rays*, only in Exod. xxxiv. 29, xxx. 35 (elsewhere נָגַהּ); רָחַף, *to brood* or *hover over*, in Piel, only Gen. i. 2, Deut. xxxii. 11; שִׁבַּת שַׁבָּתוֹן, *rest of the Sabbath*, eleven times in Exod. and Levit., elsewhere never; שֵׁנֵר, *offspring*, only in the Pentateuch; שְׁפָכָה, *effusion*, nine times, only in the Pentateuch; שִׁלְשִׁים, *great-grandchildren*, only in Gen., Exod., Numb., and Deut.; תֶּבֶל, *foul pollution*, only in the Pentateuch; תַּחְרָא, *coat of mail*, only in Exodus (later words are שִׁרְיָה, שִׁרְיוֹן, etc.).

There is, however, a remarkable homogeneousness in

most of the remains which we possess of the Hebrew literature. We cannot separate these remains into different periods, as is done in regard to Roman literature. The distinction of golden and silver ages, which Gesenius makes, does not hold throughout. The language and idiom of the Pentateuch are substantially like the language and style of the later historians and prophets.

Yet this resemblance does not by any means prove the later origin of the Pentateuch. The five books may have been written in their present form, substantially, by Moses. This may be proved by the following considerations.

1. The affirmation, that the genuineness of the Pentateuch is destroyed, because its idiom is the same as that of the other Hebrew books, thus demonstrating, as it is said, its recent authorship, proves too much. It would show that the whole body of Hebrew literature must be contemporaneous. The books of Samuel, as it is agreed on all hands, were written several hundred years before the prophecy of Malachi; yet the Hebrew of the two productions is not essentially different. Now if the identity of the style of the Pentateuch and that of Isaiah demonstrates the late origin of the former, then, for the same reason, the writer of Samuel must have been contemporaneous with the last of the prophets. If the presence of a large number of archaisms in the Pentateuch be necessary to show its Mosaic authorship, then the existence of a less number in the books of Samuel is necessary in order to show that it was written before the age of Malachi or Zechariah. There is, confessedly, a great difference in the age of different Psalms. Some, we know, were written by David. Others were composed after the captivity. Yet some of the latter are among the most beautiful and original in the whole

compass of Hebrew literature, while the style and idiom are, in all important respects, the same as those of which David was the writer. The Hebrew of the hundred and thirty-seventh Psalm has as close a resemblance to that of the eighteenth, as the Hebrew of Isaiah has to that of the Pentateuch. If an interval of several hundred years be allowed — as it is by every one — to intervene between the authorship in the case of the two Psalms, then the same may be rightfully admitted in respect to Isaiah and the Pentateuch. In other words, what proves too much, proves nothing. A course of argument that would make the Pentateuch, on the ground of style, contemporaneous with Isaiah, would make the authorship of the whole Old Testament identical in point of time, unless we except a few fragments, savoring strongly of Chaldee.

2. The Pentateuch would naturally serve as a model and common source for the writers of the subsequent portions of the Scriptures. It was the law-book, unrepealable, for the Jewish race. Constant reference must have been made to its pages, especially by the priests and the more cultivated part of the nation. They would, either intentionally or insensibly, adopt its idioms and phraseology. It contained the record of the miraculous dispensations of the Almighty towards their favored progenitors. Deviation from its style might come to be regarded almost as a moral offence. Or, if there were nothing of this superstitious reverence, still it would imperceptibly and deeply affect the entire national literature. And this is found to be actually the fact. References to the law, presuppositions of its various institutes, imitation or copying of its language, reminiscences, perfectly spontaneous, of the events recorded in it, are everywhere found in the older historical

books, the prophets, and Psalms. In four of the earlier prophets, Isaiah (not including chaps. xl.–lvi), Micah, Hosea, and Amos, there are more than EIGHT HUNDRED traces of the existence of the Pentateuch in its present form.* One cannot read even four or five chapters of these prophets, with any degree of attention, without being struck with the great number of allusions to the facts of the Pentateuch. This would often involve, of course, the quotation of the precise language employed in describing those events. There is no fact exactly parallel to this in the whole circle of literature. Luther's German version of the Bible, and King James's English version, have done much to fix the character of the German and English languages. Not a little of the best literature of the two nations is deeply tinctured with the spirit of these translations, where the exact style and language are not copied. Yet there are many circumstances that counteract this influence, which did not exist in respect to the Pentateuch. They are regarded as mere versions, no one feeling for them the reverence which is entertained for the original. They are not the fountain of civil and national law, as the Pentateuch was to the Jews. The two versions principally affect the religious and devotional literature. The case most analogous to the Pentateuch is the Korân. Its effect on Arabic literature, as will be mentioned below, has been great, for many centuries. Yet, perhaps, it has never had that marked and all-pervading influence which the five books of Moses have exerted on Hebrew literature.

3. The unchangeable character of Hebrew literature would be naturally inferred from the character of

* See Tuch, Kommentar über die Genesis, Vorrede, p. 98.

the people, and the circumstances in which they were placed.

They lived in the midst of nations who spoke the same language, or dialects closely cognate. Their own language was indigenous in Canaan. Their numerous wars were almost exclusively carried on against tribes who used the same or related languages. Of course there would be no room for any intermixtures of foreign speech from this source.

The Hebrews were strictly a religious people, connected together by the strongest ties, forbidden to engage in foreign commerce, taught to look upon the religious usages and many of the common customs of other nations with abhorrence, never inclined to travel abroad, and utterly indisposed (often in contravention to the spirit of the Mosaic law) to admit foreigners into their society. Up to the time of David, they had but little access to the Mediterranean Sea, the coast being lined by their inveterate enemies, the Philistines. They had but one large city. Nearly all their literature originated in Jerusalem. Almost all the writers, of whom mention is made, seem to have lived in the metropolis. There was no rival city, no Italian or Asiatic colony, to use and glory in a different dialect from the dialect of that proud Athenian city. All the tribes were, in an important sense, residents of Jerusalem. Three times in a year, and for days together, a great proportion of the male population mingled together in the most unreserved intercourse, — a circumstance which would strongly tend to preserve the unity and purity of the language. There were scarcely any arts or sciences to corrupt, with their nomenclature, the old forms of the language. No system of philosophy ever crept into the country. None could

have been introduced without injuring the religious spirit of the people. With the exception of the priests and Levites, the nation were almost wholly employed in the agricultural or pastoral life, — a condition which, perhaps, least of all admits of changes in idioms or in the forms of words.

We may add to these considerations, the unchangeableness which has always characterized Oriental life throughout. The same permanence which attaches to manners and customs would of course extend, more or less, to the forms of speech. Progress is the law in the West; stability, in the East. The Occidental languages are subject to the ceaseless change which characterizes all other things.* The Oriental delights to rehearse the same allegories and apothegms, expressed in the same terms, which gratified his earliest progenitors.

The structure itself of the Semitic dialects would lead us to the same general conclusion. This is manifest, e. g. in the law of triliterals, in the relation of compound nouns and derivatives to their roots, and in the perfect regularity with which the forms of the verb are developed.

4. We have, however, in direct opposition to the objection advanced, the perfect analogy of other Semitic languages. The Syriac and Arabic underwent, for many centuries, comparatively little change. The oldest remains of the Syrian, the Peshito version of the New Testament, which was prepared in the second century, agree throughout, in all essential things, with the Syriac of Barhebræus, who lived in the thirteenth century, notwithstanding the

* This is entirely consistent with the position of the degeneracy of the Orientals in knowledge and virtue. Manners, customs, languages, might be permanent, while acquaintance with the character of God and the perception of human duty were becoming obscure.

tendency of the latter, in its language and syntactical forms, to the Arabic. "That no more changes happened to the Syriac," says Hoffmann,* "in this long interval of time, is not strange; for as manners, customs, usages, etc. are altered less among Orientals than Europeans, so it is with a language; if it makes any progress, it is still more likely to remain long stationary, than to advance. As the Korân has imposed a restricted and fixed character on the Arabic language, so the most ancient monument of Syriac letters — the version of the sacred books — has effected the same in the Syriac language." It should also be recollected, that this permanence in the language was maintained while the Syrians were under subjection to a foreign power. Of course the language was more liable to corruption than could have been the case with the Hebrew before the Babylonish captivity.

A still stronger proof may be drawn from the Arabic. Professor Kosegarten of Greifswald, one of the most distinguished living Orientalists, in a review of Eichhorn's Introduction to the Old Testament, in the Jena Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung, July, 1825, has shown, by a clear and fundamental examination, that the fact of the stability, or continued unchanging character of the Arabic language, can be established by the most unquestionable proofs from the language itself, not only during a period of six hundred years, but of a thousand years, yea, for fifteen hundred years. The grammatical structure of the Arabic language remains the same in all the writers which fall within these three widely separated periods. Declensions, conjugations, constructions, are the same. The smaller, incidental de-

* Syriac Grammar, p 15.

viations are no more considerable, by any means, than the difference which appears between the language of the Pentateuch and that of the older Hebrew prophets. No greater difference is to be noted, in a lexical respect, in these Arabic writers, than that which occurs between the Pentateuch, the books of Samuel, and Isaiah. We may hence conclude, that in the Arabic language, during the fifteen hundred years in which we can examine its form, no such changes at all have taken place as appear in the German dialects, and in those derived from the Latin, in the course of a few centuries, and which have happened to the Greek language down to its present form in Modern Greek.* Consequently, the Mosaic writings might have been separated from some other books of the Old Testament by an interval of a thousand years, and at the same time exhibit but few variations in language and idiom.

We are happy to subjoin, in further corroboration of the views here presented, some more exact statements in regard to the history of the Arabic, from a friend who has long made that language his particular study.

"You are aware that the oldest specimens of Arabic literature which we possess are not more ancient than the century before Mohammed. These exhibit a highly cultivated language; the syntax is regular, the inflections are richly varied, and the vocabulary is abundant; they also show a refined musical art. It is evident, that this perfection can have been attained only by degrees; it is probably to be ascribed to the rival efforts of lyric bards of different Arab tribes. One result of these poetic efforts seems to have been, to make the peculiar expressions of each tribe

* Hartmann's Forschungen, p. 649.

a part of the authorized language of the other; a common language of literature being thus, to some extent, created, while at the same time dialectical differences distinguished the ordinary spoken language of the tribes. It thus appears, that the Arabic language, prior to Mohammed's time, was already tending to a fixed form for use in literary productions. The Korân, as you well know, was finally written out by order of the Khalif Othman in the dialect of the Koreishites, who were the dominant tribe in Mohammed's day, and that to which he himself belonged. Their dialect also had, it is probable, become the literary standard, by appropriating to itself a larger measure than other tribes of that culture which poetic rivalry put within the reach of all. But it is quite plain, that the promulgation of the Korân rather depressed and restricted literary effort among the Arabs. In style, it is far from being as rich and varied as the productions of the earlier poets; and yet it would have been presumption to think of surpassing it in language, or manner, since the superexcellence of its composition was claimed by Mohammed as an argument for its inspiration. Now came in, also, the influence of the grammarians, who, though they refer to the earlier poets, yet *prove* every thing by the Korân; all sorts of pretences are resorted to by them to make out, in every case, that the language of their Sacred Book is without fault. To this is to be added, that all the learning of the Arabs is founded in some respect upon the Korân: this book became the First Class Book, so to speak, in all schools. The Arab mind having moved in a sphere so circumscribed, since the promulgation of the Korân, ever turning to that as in prayer the Mohammedan ever faces the Kibleh, it *is* true that the written Arabic has been very little changed from that time

to this. Even the preservation of the ancient pronunciation has been provided for, in the reading of the Korân, by the perpetuation of the rules of early Korân-readers, in a special department of the schools. There would seem to be a strong presumption, that, whenever a body of sacred literature exists which has been transmitted down from a turning period in the progress of a nation's civilization, and a class of men devoted to its study, the literary language will not deviate from the model of the sacred book. This might be illustrated by the case of the Sanscrit, which, until within a few years, was even *spoken* by the Brahmins in its classic form; and which, as written, has changed very little, except in certain works where caprice seems to have driven the fancy mad, since its classic age. May it not also be true, that the *separation* of a written from a spoken language favors the preservation, generally, of the ancient purity of the former?

"The ordinary language of social intercourse, with the Arabs, must have been affected already as soon as it came to be used by foreign nations, upon whom it was forced, or who adopted it with the religion of the Prophet; though, in the palmy days of Islamism, the Moslem schools would tend to check this foreign influence. But it received still greater modifications in consequence of the less general diffusion of instruction, and the diminished stimulus to learning, and the irruptions of barbarians into Mohammedan countries after the decline of the Khalifate. The peculiarities of the spoken Arabic consist chiefly in the intermixture of foreign words, and in abbreviations of pronunciation, by which some of the more delicate distinctions of grammatical form in the written Arabic are lost. Yet I suppose it to

be a fact, that the Korân is equally intelligible to all who speak the Arabic."

It may be added, that the circumstances of the Syrians and Arabians were very different from those of the Hebrews. The former passed through many stages of cultivation. They appropriated to themselves Greek science, and were compelled to borrow many scientific terms, and thus endanger the purity of their language. The Arabians, too, entered on a career of conquest, subjugating the nations from Spain almost to China. How different was the condition of the Hebrews from the days of Joshua to Josiah! and how almost infinitely less exposed to change was the Hebrew language than its sister dialect!

VI. The Command of God in Respect to the Destruction of the Canaanites vindicated.

There are many clear indications, that the Author of nature, of the human mind, and of the Scriptures, is one and the same Being. The more profoundly we study the laws which regulate the material universe; the more closely we examine the structure and operations of our own moral and intellectual constitution; and the more intimately we become acquainted with the Bible; the more convincing will this unity of authorship in them all appear.

And yet these various revelations which God has made of himself often seem to come into direct conflict. There appear to be not only apparent discrepancies, but positive contradictions. The course of nature apparently runs counter to the written revelation; the law engraven on the tablet of the heart does not accord with that on the tablet of stone.

Sometimes our misgivings can be quieted only by pre-

sumptive reasoning. Difficulties once existed which have disappeared; discrepancies which formerly perplexed the Christian student have vanished. The works and wordof God, once on various points discordant, are no longer so. Therefore we have confident hope in respect to existing difficulties. Past experience on this subject furnishes presumptive ground for future reliance.

On no topic brought forward in the Pentateuch has greater perplexity been felt by the pious mind, than in relation to the command of God to destroy the inhabitants of Canaan; on none would there seem to be a more startling contrariety between the teachings of our moral nature and those of the Scriptures. Here, too, deism has, in all ages, forged one of its principal weapons. English infidelity, the parent of much of the Continental scepticism, has adduced it as a triumphant argument in its attack on revelation; and the impugners of the Old Testament, in our own day and country, have urged it as decisive against the divine authority of patriarchs and prophets.

It may not, therefore, be unseasonable to examine this point as fully as the limits which we have prescribed to ourselves will permit. If all Scripture be given by inspiration of God; if it be profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; then every obstacle which lies in the way of its influence should, as far as possible, be removed. All those causes which occasion perplexity, misgiving, harassing doubt, or which furnish a plausible pretext for scepticism, should be fairly and fully considered. It is to be feared, that the piety of some is built on a partial reception of divine truth, on what they view, subjectively, to be the instructions of the New Testament, as distinct from those of the Old. Such persons do

not remember, that, if the declaration of our Lord and his Apostles respecting Moses and the prophets be not admitted, then the whole basis of the new dispensation is undermined. All the declarations of Christ are to be received, or else all are to be rejected. If Moses were not inspired, then Peter and Paul spake not as the Holy Spirit moved them.

In discussing this subject, we will first state the prominent objections to which the command in question appears to be liable.

It will be recollected, that it is of the most peremptory and exclusive character. It required an extirpation of the Canaanites, root and branch. Women and children, the decrepit man as well as the armed warrior, were to be swept away. No truce was to be made, no mercy to be shown; it was excision, without mitigation or exception. The more speedy and universal the infliction, the more pleasing to Jehovah.

Now this command seems to come into sad conflict with some of the original and most benevolent instincts of our nature. It would seem harshly to interfere with that fellow-feeling common to man, to blot out those sensibilities which are weak enough at the best, but whose agency only, in the absence of revelation, renders human life tolerable. There are moments in the existence of the sternest men, when sentiments of tender compassion are felt towards the most forlorn of the race, because they share in our common humanity. Names that will be the last to perish from the page of history, are those whose philanthropy was most comprehensive. The man who has learned to look habitually with cordial good-will upon the feeblest and most degraded, comes the nearest to Him whose great object on earth was to reunite the family of man.

But the command which we are considering would seem to repress all these tendencies, and to make the executors of it selfish, malevolent, and ferocious. In order to cultivate benevolent dispositions, we must perform beneficent actions. But the edict of Jehovah, to extirpate the Canaanites, involved the necessity of inflicting all possible injury. Could philanthropy, or even the slightest feelings of humanity, exist in such scenes?

It was the maxim of a stern judge, Sir Matthew Hale, "If in criminals it be a *measuring* cast, incline to mercy and acquittal." It is a dictate of humanity and of sound reason, as well as a rule of the courts, that it is better that ten guilty persons escape, than that one innocent person should suffer. The foundations of justice are more endangered by a too rigorous enforcement, than by an excessive leniency. Yet, in the extermination of the inhabitants of Canaan, these merciful maxims were reversed or confounded. The destruction was indiscriminate. The whole Canaanitish race were involved in a common overthrow. The innocent — the comparatively innocent, at least — suffered the same fate with the most atrocious criminals.

Again, the conquest of Canaan would seem to excuse, if not to justify, war, and war in its more offensive forms. It might appear, that this terrible scourge of the human race would not receive even tacit toleration on the part of the kind and universal Parent. What, then, shall be said of a war of aggression, of foreign conquest, of extermination? The battle-field, when two armies meet in deadly encounter, is not the most sorrowful spectacle which war presents. The combatants are hardened soldiers. The little boys who once played before their father's door have

become bronzed veterans. They are familiarized to these fierce strifes, and have become what the great captain of the present age declares soldiers ought to be, — obedient machines, without a personal will or moral feeling. The most promising soldier is the one who can most readily divest himself of the higher attributes of man. When such men fall in battle, too, there is often no bitterness in death. The overwrought passion destroys or suspends all sensibility to bodily pain. In the maddening excitement, the deadly blow has been inflicted, moments, possibly hours, before it is felt. Death on the battle-field is by no means always the king of terrors.

War is seen rather in the storming of a fort, or in the sacking of a town; especially in those few preceding hours which concentrate a life of agonizing expectation, when the faint possibility of escape or rescue every moment becomes weaker, as one barrier after another is stormed. The horrors of war are felt when the wall is scaled, or the gate burst open. Its saddest sight is the domestic hearth, reddened with blood, or the little child mourning on the bosom of its dying mother, — scenes in which imagination must not enter, and which transform earth into hell.

Now parts of the Pentateuch, and the book of Joshua in particular, are a history of the sacking of cities, of the pillage of houses, of the destruction often of an unarmed and unresisting population. On the most favorable supposition, the track of the invading forces must have been marked with scenes that would appall every heart, except that of a trained warrior. A torrent of fire rolled over those fair fields that had flowed with milk and honey.

It was no light thing that would justify this invasion. No common cause, nothing short of invincible necessity, would

seem to furnish adequate grounds for the infliction of such dire calamities.

Again, this command seems to be adverse to many declarations found in the Old Testament, even in the earlier books.

The general rigor of the Mosaic system is abated by many kind and generous provisions. Not a few gentle precepts are thrown in to check the natural selfishness and cruelty of the people. Special and reiterated directions were given to the Israelites not to oppress or maltreat the stranger, the Egyptian, the Edomite, and others. The Pentateuch is not destitute of those gracious preintimations of mercy towards the Gentiles, the full benefits of which the Prophet, greater than Moses, was to confer on the whole race.

Now why should the Canaanites be excluded from these benevolent provisions? Why should they be devoted to excision, while the tyrannical and oppressing Egyptians are carefully recommended to mercy?

The doctrine of personal responsibility is often and plainly taught in the Old Testament. "The soul that sinneth, *it* shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son; the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him." Now this rule, perfectly reasonable, was not observed, it is said, with the Canaanites. The guiltless son did bear the iniquity of his father. The aged polytheist and his innocent grandson, who could not discern between his right hand and his left, were involved in a common doom. The righteousness of ten righteous men, if such there were, did not save even themselves, much less the cities where they dwelt, from destruction. The people of Nineveh, the cry of whose

wickedness went up to heaven, were spared partly, it should seem, from the fact, that there were more than six score thousand persons in it who could not discern between good and evil. Were the Canaanites worse than they? Was this doctrine of personal responsibility to hold in every case but theirs?

It is hardly necessary to say, that the destruction of the Canaanites seems to be adverse to the spirit and precepts of the New Testament. Our Lord came on an errand of good-will to man; not to destroy human life, but to save it; not to call down fire from heaven, but to heal every form of bodily disease and to summon the dead to life. The Gospel breathes a spirit of the profoundest and most comprehensive charity. No one can lay claim to its blessings, who does not heartily love his enemies and do good to his bitterest foes. Every separating wall, national distinction, and narrow-minded or sectarian prejudice, it sweeps away for ever. Universal love is its characteristic mark; fervent charity, the most honorable badge of its disciples.

How can the precepts and spirit of such a religion be reconciled with the invasion of Canaan and the indiscriminate destruction of its inhabitants? In the one case, provision is made for the utmost care and tenderness in respect to the preservation of the earthly life; in the other, the infliction of the greatest possible amount of pain and distress is positively commanded.

The principal objection, however, which has been urged against the extirpation of the Canaanites, relates to the employment of human agency in it. If the country were needed by the Israelites; if the wickedness of the people made them ripe for destruction; why were they not, it is asked, swept off by famine or fire? Why were they not

overwhelmed, as Sodom was, in a moment? The mystery of this summary visitation we might not fully fathom. Yet its awful justice we should be constrained to adore. But if the Almighty intrusts the work to human agents; if he commissions an army to ravage the land; if he lays maledictions upon them, if they do not fully perform the hard service; if he summons those to this work who have themselves hardly emerged from the savage state, not a few of them as ripe for ruin as any whom they are directed to destroy; — then an unbridled license is given to some of the worst passions of our nature; temptations are spread before man, which, it should seem, are irresistible. He is divinely commissioned to do that which he cannot perform without committing sin. One community is to be destroyed by means which will make another ripe for the same overthrow. What more fatal school of vice exists than the camp and the battle-field? "God," says the Apostle, "is not tempted of evil, neither tempteth he any man." Yet God commands that to be done, whose certain tendency seems to be the indulgence of vindictive and cruel passions. Consequently, either the moral character of God is impaired, or a considerable part of the Pentateuch and Joshua is not inspired. There is no other alternative. The eternal foundations of justice are undermined, or those books are spurious, or merely human productions. We must give up either the absolute perfection of the Almighty, or a part of his supposed revelation. The law written on the heart stands in irreconcilable hostility to that on the written page.

Various methods have been proposed to remove these formidable objections. The friends of the Bible have sometimes resorted to expedients by which the difficulties in the case do not seem to be fully appreciated. In their anxiety

to vindicate the inspired page, they have multiplied arguments which are rather plausible, than sound or pertinent.

1. The attempt is sometimes made to remove these objections by an appeal to the sovereignty and power of God. He made man. The nations of the earth are the products of his power; they lie in his hands as the clay in the hands of the potter. He holds the keys of death and of life. If he may create when and how he pleases, then he may recall or destroy what he has created. The life of the Canaanites was a mere trust. The Lender might justly demand it at his own discretion.

This method of solution, however, overlooks the main difficulty, — the manner in which the destruction was accomplished, — the employment of human agency. In the assertion of his absolute power over man's life, the Almighty would not, we are sure, impair his own attribute of justice, or infringe, in the slightest degree, the moral sense of his creatures. These must be preserved inviolate. Far be it from God to pervert or confound the moral sentiments of his creatures, or to sanction unlawful means for the attainment of desirable ends. The mere fact, that he has an uncontrolled right over human life, cannot authorize acts which do not commend themselves to the enlightened judgment of his creatures. He has made them capable of seeing and approving the rightfulness of his actions and commands.

2. Another way in which it has been proposed to remove the difficulty is by representing it as designed for the trial of man's faith. The subject is confessedly encompassed with objections. It therefore presents an occasion for the exercise of profound reverence and of unquestioning faith. It was intended, like other "hard things" in the Scriptures, to be a test of moral character. The right use is made of

it when we regard it as an inexplicable mystery. We must humbly adore rather than curiously examine. It is an important part of our moral probation quietly to acquiesce in the wisdom of Him whose path is often in the mighty waters.

But it ought also to be remembered, that the rewards of faith come not with an *indolent* reception of the truth. Resignation, prior to inquiry, is not a duty. Faith cometh by hearing, by reading, and by meditation; without these it is dead. The events of Providence, and the difficulties which we meet in the Scriptures, are for the trial of our intellect as well as of our moral powers. Do we feel interest enough in these difficulties patiently to examine them? Are we willing to task our powers on these highest of all questions? The fatal sin of the ancient Israelites consisted in the fact, that they would not consider the operations of God's hand. They were inclined slothfully to neglect to inquire into the reasons of his terrible judgments. The "hard things" which are found in the Scriptures, were intended for "our learning." Some of them can be solved by earnest and reverent investigation. It is the office, the noblest office, of reason, to institute such an inquiry. It is only after we have made these efforts that we are authorized to rest, and tranquilly appropriate to ourselves the promised blessings of an implicit faith.

Besides, this method of removing the difficulty will have no weight with a sceptical opposer. He has no faith to be tried. Our only course is to reason with him in respect to the objections that he propounds. We are to contend earnestly for the divine authority of every part of the Bible. It is our duty to search out and candidly present the best explanations which the nature of each particular case ad-

mits. One of the principal duties of Christians is, to vindicate the ways of God to men, and to convince gainsayers; not by calling upon them to believe without evidence, but by showing them what the evidence is, and that to reject it is to act in contrariety to their own reason and judgment.

It may be said, indeed, that this can never be done perfectly; that there is a depth that no line can fathom, a limit beyond which is darkness impenetrable; and that the objector will as really need faith, or a believing spirit, as any other man. This is undoubtedly true. Moral subjects do not admit of mathematical evidence. On every doctrine of the Bible, on every dispensation of Providence, difficulties will rest which no wit of man can solve. And yet they are accompanied with sufficient evidence. Every considerate man will admit them, notwithstanding their difficulties. So he acts in a thousand other cases. If reasons in favor of a particular course preponderate over the objections, then he is as really under obligations to pursue that course as if no difficulties existed. A doctrine of the Bible is attended with some real objections, yet the weight of evidence is in its favor; therefore, whoever rejects it pursues a course as unreasonable as it is pernicious. A command of God is accompanied with some unexplainable mysteries; yet if it has solid arguments in its favor, those mysteries constitute no real objection.

3. The extraordinary wickedness of the Canaanites is commonly adduced as an adequate justification of their overthrow. That they had attained to a bad eminence in crime, there can be no doubt. The Apostle's fearful portraiture of heathenism, in the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, might find its prototypes in certain insulated passages of the Old Testament, referring to the Canaan-

ites. The very soil is represented as impatient of the abominations of which it was compelled to take cognizance. The people had reached that last stage of moral corruption in which they appeared devoid of natural instincts. That brief sentence, "They caused their children to pass through the fire unto Moloch," expresses about all which the imagination can conceive both of impiety and inhumanity. It combines the essence of idolatry and ferocity.

Still, this fact does not seem to remove the serious objection which is adduced against the *method* by which the Canaanites were destroyed. If the earth had become weary of those who trod upon her bosom, why did she not open her mouth and swallow them up? Men who emulated the sin of Sodom deserved her fiery end. It should seem, that an immediate judgment from Heaven would in a moment rid the land of transgressors so abandoned. Still, the indirect, the mediate course was preferred. Human agents were employed as the ministers of vengeance. Hence we must seek for other grounds on which to vindicate the justice of God. The simple wickedness of the Canaanites does not seem to authorize the mode for their destruction which was adopted.

4. It is argued by some, that the children of Israel were the lawful heirs to the soil of Canaan, and that, in taking possession of the country, they were merely asserting their legal and indisputable rights. The Almighty had, in a solemn manner, and on repeated occasions, promised it to the patriarchs. The Proprietor of all things had given only a lease of it for a few generations to the Canaanites. The time was now come when the lawful owners must take possession of the long unreclaimed inheritance. The legal

rights, which had been in a kind of abeyance, must be forcibly asserted.

But there would seem to be but slight foundation for an hypothesis of this nature. The Canaanitish tribes had in very ancient times acquired a right to the soil which was everywhere acknowledged, and by none more readily and fully than by the Hebrew patriarchs. Abraham confessed to the children of Heth, that he was a mere stranger and sojourner in their country, and that he could acquire a right in the soil only by fair purchase. Accordingly, he bought a piece of land for a family burial-place. In like manner, Jacob purchased a parcel of a field where he had spread his tent, at the hand of the children of Hamor, for a hundred pieces of money. In short, the Canaanites seem to have had all that right to the country which can be acquired in any case. It had been theirs from time immemorial. They were in full possession of it before Abraham had left his Chaldean mountains. Portions of it had been bought and sold in innumerable instances. Even if their original right were defective, of which there is no evidence, long and undisputed possession would have given them an ample title.

We come now to what, in our opinion, may be considered a satisfactory vindication of the benevolence and justice of God in relation to this question. Men, or any created beings, may be innocently employed in inflicting deserved punishment on their fellow-creatures. The service imposes upon them no necessity of committing sin. On the contrary, the execution of such a command, on the part of man, is perfectly consistent with the maintenance of sound moral feelings and a benevolent temper.

1. This point receives some confirmation from what appears to be implied, if not directly taught, in the Scriptures, namely, that creatures of a higher order than man have been, and will be, employed in executing the wrath of God on their disobedient companions, and on sinners of the human race. The Scriptures contain several intimations, hints, or foreshadowings of this truth, as well as direct assertions of it. Angels were employed in the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah. Subsequently, the Assyrian army fell beneath the sword of the destroying angel. In the last great day, the Son of Man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them that do iniquity, and shall cast them into a furnace of fire. Now God is not tempted of evil, neither tempteth he man or angel. This hard duty imposed upon the creature is not necessarily sinful. The angel might cherish vindictive feelings, and he might not. He may execute these sentences of Divine Justice without one wrong emotion. And what is possible for him is possible for man. What may be done without sin by the one may be by the other. What would lay upon either a natural necessity to sin would not be imposed upon either. God's command to men is not graduated according to the sinfulness of the creature. It may involve a severe temptation to evil, but if there be no invincible necessity in the case, then it may be right. The prophet Samuel destroyed a prince of the Amalekites in a terrible, and what some would pronounce a shocking, manner. He did it, there is every reason to suppose, in accordance with the Divine will, and without committing sin in the act. On the contrary, for not doing it, Saul fell under the Divine displeasure, and was deprived of his kingdom and his life. Now what was practicable

for Samuel, and a virtuous act in his case, was so for every other Israelite.

2. We should be led to infer the rightfulness of the command from the ordinary operations of Divine Providence. Individual men and nations, in numberless instances, have been made the instruments of inflicting terrible evils on other individuals and communities. Doubtless in most of these cases they have done it in order to gratify their own selfish passions. They were unwilling instruments in the hands of God. Through them he made the wrath of other men, and of other nations, to praise him. An immense amount of good was accomplished, yet it was in direct contrariety to their intentions. But has it been so in every instance? Has no man or community consciously and willingly executed the commands of God? Have all, who have been the instruments of the Almighty, been forced into His service against their will? Has selfish or malignant passion been in every instance the controlling motive? Were the Waldenses, when they rolled down the rocks from their Alpine fastnesses on the heads of their bloodthirsty foes, performing an act out of which, and against its nature, God, in his wonder-working providence, educed good, while these wretched wanderers were only gratifying their personal ill-will? No! Every true protestant on the face of the earth, from that time to the present, would affirm that the deed was right in every aspect of it. So also when the people of the Low Countries rose up, and burst open the Inquisition, and expelled the Spaniard from the country, at the cost of rivers of blood, was it a sinful instrumentality? Were the feelings actuating these oppressed Netherlanders necessarily wrong? No! is the unanimous verdict of every impartial historian in Christendom.

But however it may be in these cases, there is one instance fully in point, and where we cannot be mistaken. God commissioned Cyrus, king of Persia, to destroy Babylon and deliver his chosen people. He called him by name more than a hundred years before his birth, and designated him to the work. This Divine commission was made known to the Persian king, either by direct revelation, or by Isaiah's prophecy, so that he acted, as he himself informs us, as the conscious and willing instrument of Jehovah. Babylon was, therefore, destroyed by him in obedience to the will of Heaven, and not simply to carry out his plans of conquest. He acknowledges the authority of Jehovah, and earnestly promotes the restoration of the exiles. Here, then, is a case precisely analogous to that of the Canaanites, and against which, so far as we know, no objection is urged. Yet the destruction of Babylon involved an amount of suffering, an indiscriminate slaughter of the innocent and guilty, which, perhaps, transcended all that was inflicted on the people of Canaan.

From this and other analogous instances, we may certainly infer, that human agents may be innocently employed, and consciously so to themselves, in administering punishment on sinning nations and individuals. This would be a natural presumption from the general course of Divine Providence. If the fearful tragedy enacted within the walls of Babylon was right; if the scenes which were witnessed in the valleys of Piedmont and the glens of Scotland, when those who had been hunted like sheep on the mountains rose on their merciless foes, cannot be proved to be wrong; then the tribes of Canaan might be destroyed in consistency with the moral attributes of God.

3. The position may be fully established from the rec-

ognition of civil government in the New Testament. Rulers are ordained of God. Whoever resisteth them resisteth the ordinance of God, no matter what the form of government may be. Now the very statement of the case shows that it is their right and duty to use forcible means, if necessary, in administering the government. They bear not the sword in vain. They are a terror to evil-doers. But if this were not directly asserted, it would follow from the nature of the case. If a command be lawful, all those steps which are necessary in order to execute that command are lawful. The indispensable means, as well as the end, are sanctioned. Now it is the duty of the magistrate, made so by the word of God, to suppress an insurrection, peaceably if he can, forcibly if he must. In this popular tumult, a city or province may be involved. To suppress it may demand a great sacrifice of life, both of the innocent as well as the guilty. It may be utterly impracticable to make the discrimination. Every instance of this kind has doubtless led to the destruction of persons who were not guilty. Yet the magistrate was not in fault. He could not maintain his authority, and put an end to the mischief, without storming a city. Is he to desist because of the hazard to the innocent women and children within its walls? Certainly not, if human government is to be maintained. The right and the duty of maintaining this, the New Testament positively affirms. Now no government has ever existed on earth for any length of time, which has not found it necessary, in the execution of its orders, to inflict suffering even unto death on the innocent, as well as on the guilty. Without the power to do this, it could not exist. But if it were wrong, then the Bible has been virtually in opposition to all actual governments, or, in effect, in opposition to its

own precepts. It follows, that the children of Israel were not necessarily committing sin in extirpating the Canaanites, though innocent children, and others not specially in fault, were involved in the common doom.

4. It may be shown, from its effects on the Israelites, that the infliction of suffering and death on one's fellow-creatures does not of necessity lead to sin. It was the means of salutary moral discipline. Though painful, it produced the peaceable fruits of righteousness.

It was, doubtless, a hard task for Sir Matthew Hale to pronounce some of the sentences which he did pronounce, as they carried extreme sorrow and wretchedness into many families. Yet who can doubt but that the judge was eminently conscientious, that his decisions were generally just, and that they contributed to his own moral improvement? There is no doubt but that General Washington assumed the command of the American army as a matter of duty. He had no love for war or military distinction. The sad scenes through which he passed did not harden his heart, nor enkindle any revengeful or malignant passions. His recorded sayings and his subsequent life most fully confirm this. Yet his was a fearful path. He unsheathed the sword against the native land of his ancestors. He took up arms against his own kindred. He, more than any other American, was the cause of unutterable distress to many families left without husband or father.

Not altogether dissimilar was the situation of the leader of the Israelites in the conquest of Canaan. He accepted his commission in obedience to the command of God. He and his immediate associates performed what they considered to be an unquestionable duty. They found in their career no invincible temptations to the indulgence of mali-

cious or cruel passions. The work was conscientiously undertaken, and there is not the slightest intimation, that the result was in any degree unfavorable to the character of these leaders. The contrary is perfectly obvious. A firmer trust in God, a more entire devotedness to his service, illustrate the last days of him on whom the mantle of the lawgiver descended. He was thus counted worthy to stand in that illustrious company, "who through faith subdued kingdoms, escaped the edge of the sword, out of weakness were made strong, waxed valiant in fight, turned to flight the armies of the aliens."

Now what did not prove an incitement to sin in the leaders, could not necessarily be so to the mass of the soldiers. If the one party escaped the fiery trial unharmed, the other might escape. That which strengthened the virtuous principle, or increased faith in God in one man, might accomplish the same in ten or one hundred individuals, acting in similar circumstances.

What now was the great moral effect which God intended to produce on the minds of the Israelites? It was evidently this, to awaken in them the deepest abhorrence of idolatry, a detestation of the worship of false gods, an inextinguishable hatred of its untold cruelties. Now the destruction of the Canaanites by an immediate Divine judgment could not have made the lesson so impressive. The Israelites might have been filled with astonishment in seeing God's wrath descending, as it did on Sodom, in a storm of fire. They might have been overwhelmed with terror, as some of their fathers were when the earth opened her mouth and swallowed up Korah and his company; and yet, in the space of a month or a year, they might have been ripe for the same rebellion and the same end. A slower

process, a more detailed exhibition of God's punitive justice, was needed. Idolatry must be seen in its horrid *particulars*. No impression could be so deep as that made by personal observation. Long-continued inspection of the pagan rites must have taught lessons that could never be effaced. "Here," the invading army might say, "the Supreme God was publicly dethroned in mock solemnity; yonder, in that valley, Moloch was worshipped,

'besmeared with blood
Of human sacrifice and parent's tears';

on that high hill, under that lofty oak, we saw abominations practised, for which happily we have no name. The bestiality of Sodom infected the land. The very soil seemed to cry aloud for purification, and the air itself loathed the corruption that it was compelled to sustain." *

In such circumstances, much of the horror which commonly accompanies warlike scenes would disappear. The dreadful human sacrifices offered up by the Mexicans, greatly diminish the sympathy which we should otherwise feel for them when attacked by Cortés. Those who demolished the Bastile in Paris, and the prisons of the Inquisition in Spain, were really laborers in the cause of humanity, though human life was to some extent sacrificed. The Hebrews — worshippers of one God and taught to hold idolatry in the greatest abhorrence — might regard themselves as

* The moral corruption of the descendants of some of the Canaanitish tribes that were spared, e. g. the Carthaginians, was proverbial throughout the pagan world. Increasing refinement had almost annihilated among other nations the cruel practice of offering human sacrifices, but nothing could prevail upon the Carthaginians to abandon it, though thereby they became an abhorrence to all civilized men. The licentiousness of the Syrians was equally proverbial with their cruelty. See Hengstenberg, Beiträge, II. 506.

innocent executioners of a richly deserved punishment. A virtuous indignation might have been the predominant feeling in their breasts. Every sentiment of compassion towards the Canaanites must have been shocked, if not wholly paralyzed, by the cruel and obscene rites, the proofs or the actual performance of which they were often compelled to witness. They were not dealing with personal foes, nor gratifying private malice. They were the appointed ministers of Him whose peculiar glory the people of Canaan were foully desecrating. The invading army were under no more necessity of indulging in personal ill-will or cruelty, than the individual judge or magistrate of the present day, when called to pronounce or execute the sentences of the law. If the temptation to sin were greater in the former case, so would the rewards of successfully resisting it be correspondingly greater. That the temptation in question was resisted, we have incontrovertible evidence from the history. The age of Joshua was the golden age of the Jewish people in respect to true piety, or obedience to the laws of God. In confirmation of this, we might advert to the circumstances and happy settlement of the difficulty which occurred between the warriors of the two tribes, and the half tribe whose abode was on the east of the Jordan and their brethren who lived west of the river. Both parties were actuated by fraternal feelings and by a high regard for the true religion. So, in Judges ii. 7, there is the following decisive testimony: "And the people served the Lord all the days of Joshua, and all the days of the elders that outlived Joshua, who had seen all the great works of the Lord, that he did for Israel." This passage proves that the people came out of the war true and zealous worshippers of Jehovah, and it also indicates the manner in which

they maintained their integrity and derived moral benefit from the scenes through which they had passed. It was a holy war which they had waged. They were the soldiers of the Lord of hosts. They had taken up arms not so much against human life, or a public enemy, as against a most revolting form of polytheism. They boasted not as if their own arm had gotten them the victory. It was "the great works of the Lord" that had secured the triumph. The stars in their courses fought for Israel. For them the sun had stood still on Gibeon and the moon in the valley of Ajalon. To their Almighty Deliverer, they felt disposed to raise, at the close of the strife, the grateful song of thanksgiving.

THE IMPRECATIONS IN THE SCRIPTURES.*

THERE is a class of objections against the divine authority of the Bible, which relate simply to matters of taste, conventional usage, national custom, or Oriental modes of feeling. A sufficient answer to objections of this nature is, that if the Scriptures had been conformed to modern and European modes and tastes, they would, in the same degree, lose one of the principal evidences of their genuineness. The local coloring about them, their Asiatic dress, the figures of speech which the writers employ, assure us that they are the men whom they profess to be, and that they lived at the time, and in the countries, in which they assume to have lived. The seal of honesty is thus affixed to them. We feel certain that they are men of truth. This species of evidence, though incidental and undesigned, is, in fact, one of the most important, and one least liable to be counterfeited. Besides, if the writers had undertaken to conform to what we understand by correct taste and propriety in forms of speech, they would have undertaken an impracticable task. The standard of taste, on many points, is

* This Essay was originally published in the Bibliotheca Sacra, for February, 1844.

perpetually changing. In respect to certain matters, there is a degree of fastidiousness in this country, which does not exist in the higher circles in Europe. What passes current there at the present moment, may not pass so one hundred years hence.

Another class of objections to the divine authority of the Bible, resolves itself into our unavoidable ignorance. There are certain discrepancies between different parts of the Scriptures, small for the most part, which we find it impossible wholly to reconcile, because we have not the requisite information. The matter was perfectly understood at the time the books were written, but some link in the chain of evidence has disappeared; some contemporary, uninspired writer furnished the clew, but his works have been lost, and we are necessarily left in uncertainty.*

This objection, however, may be turned into an argument in favor of the trustworthiness of the writers. About all honest authors there is a species of noble negligence. They are not particularly careful to frame every thing so that it will exactly fit to every other portion of a narrative or discourse. This is the artifice of one who intends to deceive, and who is afraid to trust his readers. To have made every thing of this kind in the Scriptures perfectly clear, would have required an enlargement of them altogether at variance with their intended popular diffusion, and equally injurious to the habits of inquiry in the student.

There are difficulties of another kind, which must for ever remain unremoved, not because of our ignorance, but from the limited nature of our faculties. There is a borderland between the known and the unknown on which clouds

* The subject of the baptism for the dead, 1 Cor. xv. 29, is difficult of explanation, because of the silence of contemporary writers.

and darkness must always rest. We cannot even gain glimpses of the truth, nor form conjectures which have any plausibility. There are points connected with the higher doctrines of Christianity, which there is no reason to suppose will be any more level to our comprehension in the future state than they are now, for the reason that they are not cognizable by a created being in any stage of his progress. They are not open to analysis. We can neither discover their nature, nor cast any light upon them by analogy. Now the Scriptures are not to be blamed for announcing the simple fact of the existence of particular objects or relations, unattended with a word of explanation. They could not make a revelation in regard to certain subjects, without involving allusions to relations or modes of being, or presupposing their existence, which it would be utterly impossible for us to comprehend. He who cavils at these inexplicable difficulties, shows that he has no conception of what a divine revelation must be.

There is a difficulty of a still more serious character than any which has been alluded to, and which is urged against many passages in the Psalms and in other parts of the Bible. This is, the wishing of evil to one's enemies, the imprecating of curses upon those who have injured us, the expression of joy in seeing calamity alight upon the wicked.

The objection arising from this source against the inspiration of the Scriptures is more formidable, perhaps, than any other; or, at any rate, it is attended with some peculiar difficulties. It is felt alike by all classes of readers, unless it be in fact more perplexing to the common Christian, than it is to the professed scholar. It does not, perhaps, absolutely unsettle the faith of any believer in the Bible, but it occasions misgivings, painful doubts, and a disposition

to pass by unread the portions of the Bible in question. A circumstance which increases the perplexity is, that the imprecation is often found in close connection with language which indicates the firmest trust in God, or a high state of devotional feeling. It cannot easily be detached from things which seem to have no possible affinity with it. How can feelings so opposite coexist?

Again, the imprecation of a calamity upon another is apparently at war with some of the better feelings of our nature. It runs counter to the common sentiments of compassion within us. We pity a brute, though it may have injured us, especially if we behold it in a condition of suffering. It would, also, seem to be opposed to the dictates of natural religion. We see that God sends his rain upon the just and unjust, that he is constantly doing good to those who deny his authority, or blaspheme his name. The indications throughout the realms of nature and Providence would certainly lead us to feel that we should be like our Heavenly Father, and open the hand of liberal kindness to all men, to enemies and strangers as well as to kindred and friends. Most men, indeed, who enjoy the light of nature only, adopt a different practical course and take delight in acts of revenge. But this is certainly at variance with that which they might know of God and of their own duty.

Above all, however, it would seem to be wholly adverse to the spirit of the New Testament. Our Lord gave a new commandment, that we should love one another. When thine enemy hungers, feed him. I say unto you, love your enemies; pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you; speak evil of no man; not returning railing for railing, but, contrariwise, blessing. The whole tenor and spirit of the Gospel is disinterested benevolence, comprehen-

sive charity. How are we to reconcile the loving spirit of the new dispensation with the direful maledictions of the old? When there is such a want of harmony in the different parts of the Scriptures, how can the whole be from that perfect Being, whose precepts must be all self-consistent?

The numerous, though unsatisfactory, methods which have been adopted for the purpose of obviating the difficulty, betray the anxiety which has been caused by it in the pious mind.

I will advert to the more plausible of these methods. It has been suggested by some interpreters, among them the venerable Dr. Scott, that many of those passages which appear in our English version as imprecatory, as expressing a wish or desire for the infliction of evil, should be rendered as a simple affirmation, or as merely declaratory of what will take place in regard to the wicked, on the ground that the verb in the original is in the future tense where our translation has given it an optative or imprecatory signification, — the Hebrew language having no peculiar form to express the various senses of the optative.

But what shall be said of the numerous passages where the verb is in the imperative? For example: "Pour out thine indignation upon them; let thy wrathful anger take hold upon them."*

What shall be affirmed in relation to the texts where those are pronounced blessed who take vengeance upon an enemy? "Happy shall he be who rewardeth thee as thou hast served us! Happy shall he be that taketh and dasheth thy little ones against the stones!"

In what manner, again, shall we vindicate those passages

* Ps. lxix. 24, 25; also Ps. lv. 10.

where the righteous are described as looking with complacency, feasting their eyes, as it were, upon the calamities of their oppressors? "The righteous shall rejoice when he seeth the vengeance; he shall wash his feet in the blood of the wicked."

It would manifestly, therefore, be of no avail, if we were permitted, to render certain passages in a declaratory or prophetic sense, which are now rendered as indicating a wish or desire. The difficulty would exist elsewhere in its full extent. It is hardly necessary to say that the affirmation itself, in regard to the Hebrew language, is untenable. There are forms of the verb in Hebrew, and there are connected particles, which oblige us to translate by the terms *let*, *may*, and others, which are expressive of wish or desire.* Often, too, the context will not justify any other rendering.

Another way in which it has been attempted to remove the difficulty, is to consider it as a peculiarity of the old dispensation, as one of the things engrafted upon the Mosaic economy which the Christian dispensation does not recognize; as consonant with the general spirit of the Jewish theocracy, but which a clearer revelation would annul.

But God is the author of these dispensations, and the general spirit of the two must be the same. We ought not to vindicate one Testament at the expense of the other. What is essentially bad at one period, must be so at all times. It is no less wrong for Joshua to indulge in malice towards the Canaanites, than it is for the Apostle Paul towards Nero. Cruelty is no more tolerated in the Pentateuch than it is in the Epistle. He has not been a careful reader of the book of Deuteronomy, who has not observed

* See Gesenius's Heb. Gram. (Conant's Transl.), pp. 249, 262; Nordheimer, § 1078.

the special pains which God took to impress upon the hearts of the Israelites the importance of treating kindly, not only the widow and the orphan, but the stranger, the Egyptian, the hired servant who was not of their own nation. No small part of the Levitical law, is taken up with commands and appeals designed to counteract the narrow and selfish spirit of the Hebrews.

Besides, the principle runs through the entire Scriptures, the New Testament as well as the Old. "Alexander the coppersmith did me much evil. May the Lord reward him according to his works!" It is not easy to see how this differs materially from the imprecations in the book of Psalms.

It has been supposed by some, that the passages in question are to be understood in a spiritual sense; that the reference to individuals is not real, but imaginary, assumed for the time being, and for an ultimate purpose wholly different from what lies on the face of them; that is, we are to apply these various maledictions to our spiritual foes, imprecating on them the terrible calamities which were apparently, but only apparently, intended for the personal enemies of the sacred writers.

The simple statement of such a position is enough to show its absurdity. If Doeg, Ahithophel, and Alexander the coppersmith, were not real persons, what were they? Besides, whither would such a principle of interpretation carry us?

Others, still, have conjectured that temporal calamities only were desired, there being no allusion to those which may affect the soul in the future state.

But it is difficult to perceive how the principle in the one case differs from that in the other. If we may pray that a

particular person may "go down alive and instantly into the grave," and that the direst plagues may fall on his family, till their very name is blotted out, do we not necessarily include those heavier evils which the soul shall suffer hereafter? It seems to be a distinction without a difference. Many passages, too, are general in their character. They do not appear to be limited to punishments which are specific in their nature, or temporary in their duration.

I come now to what, I think, must be regarded as a justification of the language in question; as going to account, in a great measure, if not wholly, for the usage of the sacred writers.

The principle may be best stated by two or three illustrations. Doeg, an Edomite herdsman, in the time of Saul, killed eighty-five unarmed, helpless priests, when he knew that they were wholly innocent of the charge made against them, and when no one else dared to touch these consecrated servants of the Lord. But with this he was not satisfied; every woman and child, every breathing thing, fell under the assassin's knife. Now the very mention of the atrocity stirs up feelings in us which cannot be repressed, and which are only rendered the more poignant by reflection on the attendant circumstances.

The murder of the children at Bethlehem, by Herod, another Edomite, was an act of gratuitous cruelty, which the imagination utterly refuses to carry out into its details. The shriek of the frantic Rachel, in every dwelling where there was a little child to be struck down, is all that the heart can bear. Towards the author, every reader of the history, from his day down, has had but one feeling. The horrors of conscience that he suffered on account of his murder of his wife Mariamne, and which almost antedated

those pains that shall never have an end, do not awaken for him the slightest degree of sympathy. A happy end to that turbulent life would have shocked us.

The woman that wished the head of the venerable forerunner of our Lord to be brought to her in a basin, — who desired to enjoy a sight which would have curdled the blood of any one else, — has excited a feeling in every reader's breast, that no lapse of time has in the least degree diminished. The simple words of the Gospel are enough. We wish not a word of commentary. Every right-minded man has one, on the living fibres of his heart.

The striking of a great bell at midnight in Paris was the signal of a deed at which men shudder now, at the distance of nearly four hundred years. It was a night long to be remembered. It needed no record on the page of history. It is engraven in ineffaceable characters on the moral sense of all Protestant Christendom. It was an outrage upon the nature which God has given to his creatures, which admits of no apology, and which necessarily demanded an atonement that is not yet fully paid.

In the darkest moments of the French Revolution, we are consoled by one circumstance. There is light in one quarter of that midnight horizon. The day of retribution will come. Every spectator of the tragedy feels, if he does not say, "Blessed shall he be who rewardeth thee as thou hast done to others." And when the cup is poured into the lips, — to the very dregs, — there is a satisfaction, not so much heartfelt as *conscience-felt*. A great moral debt has been paid. God's righteous government has taken a firmer hold of men in consequence. The Divine veracity has received a new illustration. He who sowed the wind has reaped the whirlwind.

What is the character of the principle thus manifested? What is the nature of these emotions?

A primary element of it is indignation. Before we have had time to reflect, there is an instant, a spontaneous gush of the emotion of anger towards the evil-doer. We cannot prevent it if we would. It is prior to all deliberation. In its first outbreak it is above control. It is outraged nature, that will have vent. In the commission of a great wrong, particularly where the accompanying circumstances are such as to strongly arrest attention, the being is something more or less than human whose soul is not deeply stirred.

Another element is compassion towards the injured party. We have an instinctive pity for weakness crushed in the dust, for innocence betrayed and violated. The wailing cry of infancy is in our ears; the white locks of age, draggling in the dust, are in our sight. An unoffending man, because he would not alienate the inheritance of his fathers, is defrauded of his rights, and then taken and murdered on religious grounds, by lying testimony. Sentiments of the tenderest interest in the wretched sufferer spring up. Our hearts rush towards him with the warmest compassion. We would rescue him, if possible, ere the fatal stone be thrown. Thousands in our land can testify to such an emotion — deep, and not to end but with life — towards the hapless aborigines of this country, cheated and worn out by a long course of successful villany.

Another and a principal ingredient is a sense of justice. When a crime of extraordinary atrocity goes unpunished, we feel that justice is defrauded of its dues. We are indignant that such a wrong should be unredressed. While the crime is unatoned for, we have a feeling, not only of

insecurity, but that justice has been violated. Public order is disturbed; a shock has been given to that sense of rectitude which is common to man.

This is not of momentary duration, as the indignant or compassionate feeling may be. It grows stronger with the lapse of time. Reflection only adds to its intensity. Deliberation but shows its reasonableness. In other words, when a great outrage is perpetrated, nothing will calm the perturbation of our moral nature but the infliction of a penalty. The grievance must be redressed. A voice within us calls imperatively for reparation, whether we or others are the authors of the deed. The endurance of suffering is an indispensable condition for the return of peace. We secretly desire the speedy infliction of the penalty on ourselves, if we are conscious of guilt, and on others, also, if they are the evil-doers. And what we crave by an irrepressible instinct of our moral nature, may we not, on fit occasions, *express in language?* *

My next remark is, that it is an original principle of our nature; it is a simple and ultimate fact. It has all the marks of being such, which can be affirmed in relation to any attribute of our nature. It is, in the first place, instantaneous in its manifestation. Its movements are rapid as the light. It gives no notice of its coming; neither can we stay it. In certain circumstances, it will arise, in despite of all the physical and moral obstacles which we can array against it. In this respect, it stands precisely on the ground of the other original properties of our constitution.

Again, it is universal, and therefore original. It has shown itself in all ages, in every state of society and

* See the fine and almost Christian remarks which are made on this subject near the close of Plato's Gorgias.

period of human life, among the rudest and the most refined. Wherever the voice of a brother's blood has cried from the ground, it has found an answering echo in every bosom, no matter whether in the midst of the most polished society, or in the remotest outskirts of paganism. Or, if it has shown unwonted strength, it is in the breast of him who has the most refinement, and who has advanced the furthest in the Christian life, because such a one has the most comprehensive acquaintance with the bad effects of crime, and the greatest desire that right should triumph over fraud, and, in general, that state of the moral feelings which best fits him to show the genuine sentiments of his heart.

In the third place, its universality is attested in another way, in the most decisive manner. There are literary productions which speak to man *as* man, to his original and indestructible tendencies; productions that are so framed as to strike chords in every human breast. Now some of the greatest of these works proceed on the ground that justice cannot be appeased without the infliction of suffering, and that the desire of evil, either to be poured out upon ourselves or others, as the case may be, instead of being an unnatural desire, is, on the contrary, one of our deepest aspirations, and its gratification an indispensable condition of happiness, or even of a tolerable measure of quiet. The catastrophe is painful; but the contrary would be far more so. In the ultimate triumph of fraud and high-handed crime, every sentiment of justice within us is shocked. The author who would conduct us to such a result, either does not understand the deeper principles of his own moral being, or he wantonly trifles with them. Our moral nature "cries aloud," that it is meet that those who commit enormous crimes should be visited with a proportionable

doom. When the avenger of blood overtakes such a one, we are glad that he did not reach the city of refuge. Now the highest work of genius is the exactest transcript of these original states and demands of our nature.

It may be maintained, further, that this feeling is not necessarily accompanied with any malice or ill-will towards the sufferer. An atrocious crime is committed in our neighborhood; we have the strongest sympathy for the injured party, and indignation towards the evil-doer. We unite in all proper measures to bring him to what we call a condign, that is, a deserved punishment. We rejoice when we learn that he has been apprehended, and that justice is permitted to take its appointed course. If we do not, in so many words, imprecate calamities upon him, we feel, and we perform, what amounts to the same thing. We ardently desire and pray that he may suffer punishment. If he is proved to be guilty, we are disappointed if he escape. We are even eager to coöperate in efforts to bring him within the arm of the law. But all this is not attended with any desire to witness the sufferings of a human being, or that those sufferings, in themselves, should be felt. We have no malice or private revenge to gratify. The absorbing emotion is for the good of society. We have the persuasion, that, if the criminal escapes, the bonds that hold men together will be weakened, if they are not destroyed. That there may be this entire freedom from personal ill-will, is shown by the fact, that our feelings are precisely similar, in kind at least, towards an offending contemporary or neighbor, and towards a notorious culprit who lived ages ago, or may now live at the ends of the earth, and whose punishment, or escape from it, cannot possibly affect us personally. The utterance of this moral feeling is the utter-

ance of humanity within us. It is an expression of sympathy in the well-being of the race. If it be the faintest sigh of some abused exile among the snows of Siberia; if it be an ancient Briton, standing on the last rock where freedom could find a resting-place; if it be an American Indian, looking for the last time on the grave of his father, just as insatiate avarice is about to drive his plough through it, — the feeling within is one and identical. Time and space are overleaped in the twinkling of an eye. Our hearts gather instantly around these despairing wretches. Towards their oppressors we feel no hate or revenge. But till retribution has been made in some way, till suffering has been felt in some form, it is impossible for us to rest in quietness. The delicate framework of our moral being has been deranged. It must be repaired by the infliction of suffering.

Instead of the feeling in question being necessarily sinful, it may, on the contrary, be the evidence of a generous sympathy, of a finely educated conscience, and of a character conformed to the great standard of perfection. Not to possess this moral sympathy, might indicate a pusillanimous nature, a dulness of spiritual apprehension, and no desire that the disorders in God's kingdom should be rectified.

The connection of this original principle of our nature, which has been briefly developed, with the imprecations in the Psalms and in other parts of the Bible, is obvious. If it does not account for all, it still lies at the foundation of a large portion of them. In other words, these imprecatory passages are justified by a primary and innocent feeling of our nature. Were we placed in the condition of the sacred penmen, we should feel, and properly feel, as they felt.

The sight of the shameless cruelty of an Edomitish herdsman, if it did not dictate an imprecatory poem, would unavoidably awaken those feelings on which that poem is founded. The impartial spectator, as he stood on the smoking ashes of Jerusalem, and saw the Idumeans as they stimulated the fierce Chaldeans to "raze" the holy city to its foundations, and heard them suggest new and ingenious methods of cruelty, would join in the emotions which called forth, if he did not in the words which express, the maledictions of the hundred and thirty-seventh Psalm. Let any right-minded reader look at the lives of Antiochus Epiphanes, of the first Herod, of some of the Roman emperors, of the Fouquier Tinvilles and Carriers of the French Revolution, and fail, if he can, to rejoice, yea, exult, when the same cup is wrung out to them which they had mingled for others. The feeling in the minds of those who penned the fifty-fifth and sixty-ninth Psalms was not malice. It was the indignation excited by cruelty and injustice, and the desire that crime should be punished. They, doubtless, followed the precept, Be ye angry, and sin not. If we were acquainted with the circumstances which called forth the imprecatory Psalms, we should, doubtless, find, as the cause or occasion, striking cases of treachery, practised villany, and unblushing violations of law.

Our Saviour uttered awful anathemas against the hypocritical Scribes and Pharisees. These were authorized, not simply on the ground, that he knew the hearts of men, and, as judge of the world, had a right to anticipate the final sentence, but from the atrocity of their crimes. On account of the reputed sanctity of their characters, they were often made the depositaries for safe keeping of the pittance of

widows, or they became guardians of the estates of orphans. These sacred funds, they artfully embezzled and appropriated to their personal use, while the helpless owner sought for redress in vain, because the judge in the case might be the swindler himself. No wonder our Saviour denounced the vengeance of Heaven on these sanctimonious thieves and repudiators. His anathemas were sanctioned by a feeling which we have in common with him, and which, on extraordinary occasions, we not only cherish, but express or imply in language. If we had been fully possessed of the facts, and all the attendant circumstances, as he knew them, or as his disciples might, in a degree, have known them, we should have seen ample ground for his terrible denunciations.

Our position is, indeed, different, in certain respects, from that of the inspired writers, or of the ancient Jews. The Israelites were authorized by God himself to exterminate some of the tribes by whom they were surrounded. This distinct commission would justify a style of address in respect to these tribes, which would not be proper in other circumstances. We have no such general commission.

Again, we live under a milder and more spiritual dispensation, and we are taught rather to bear injury uncomplaining, and to refer the taking of vengeance to Him to whom it properly belongs. We are never to cherish malice or ill-will. We are in all cases to love our enemies, and forgive those who injure us. These circumstances, however, do not seem to militate against the view which has been taken. There are times now, in great national questions, and when the ends of public justice are to be answered, when the original principle of our nature is innocently and necessarily brought into active operation. Without it, we should look

unmoved upon the most stupendous crimes, for no other feature of our moral constitution can be a substitute for this. The danger of its abuse, the fact that it often degenerates into a feeling of malevolence or a desire for private revenge, does not alter its nature, or render the indulgence of it unlawful. It remains a principle implanted in our nature by the Creator himself, as really as pity, or any other emotion.

Had all the angels in heaven persevered in their allegiance to their Maker, *one* power within them had for ever slumbered; one susceptibility had remained unawakened. They had never known by actual experience the feeling of joy in seeing the course of justice fulfilled. The angels who kept their first estate must have approved the sentence which doomed their companions to those penal fires which they still feel. A new aspect of their moral being thus becomes apparent; a new principle of their original nature is developed; a resource is provided against an exigency which was to happen. A fresh illustration is given of the wisdom of Him, who fearfully and wonderfully framed the angel's nature; so constituting it, that an act of punitive justice, when demanded, would not seem arbitrary, but would be fully justified by every one who should behold the spectacle, or who should suffer in consequence of his deeds.

So, also, with the father of our race. While in paradise, he could hardly be conscious of the powers that were wrapped up within him. All which he had seen was clothed in the smile of perfect love; all which he had felt or imagined was an index of naught but of self-satisfying delight, and of the overflowing Divine benignity. But when he was exiled from his happy abode, he had a new experience of

the awful wisdom of his Creator. He was not expelled by arbitrary authority. Those flaming cherubim were not an emblem of gratuitous wrath. In the depths of his being, he felt that it was just. His newly awakened moral instinct justified his expulsion. So when he stood over the lifeless body of his second-born, with emotions such as no other father since has looked upon a dead child, one part of his experience must have been the perception of the Divine justice. "In that still form, and closed eye," he might say, "a strange aspect of my being is evolved. I feel within me the workings of a hitherto unknown sensation. I felt at first like imprecating vengeance on the fratricide, but that is past. My own sin is here visible. It was my hand that opened the great flood-gate. Righteous art thou, O Lord, in thy judgments."

Cain, too, — we have sometimes wondered that, instead of complaining of the severity of his sentence, he did not imprecate a heavier doom; that he did not desire that the demands of justice should be executed speedily on himself. That he did not so wish may indicate that he was qualified, by the possession of a hardened character, to stand at the head of the long line of murderers.

In thus briefly considering one of the sterner features of our constitution, and some of its practical developments, we cannot but be struck with the morbid type of much of the philanthropy and religion current at the present day. Love degenerates into weakness; compassion becomes itself an object of pity; benevolence is degraded into an undiscriminating instinct. The employment of force is branded as a relic of barbarous times. The exercise of authority is scouted as contrary to the spirit both of the Gospel and of an enlightened age. The world must now be controlled by

persuasion. It was formerly supposed that law, with its rigorous penalty, was a chief instrument in moral reformations; that it was one of the main elements in the means which God and man must employ in meliorating the state of society.

So, likewise, in respect to religion. In our days, there is such a prominent and reiterated exhibition of the paternal character of God, as to endanger, if not destroy, its legitimate effect on the character of His intelligent creatures. There is such a protrusion of the promises of the Bible, and such a concealment of its threatenings, as to neutralize the influence of both. Religion is sometimes so divested of its grander and sterner qualities, as to fail to secure any respect. It becomes a mere collection of pleasant counsels, an assemblage of sweet recommendations, which it would be very well to observe; instead of presenting, as it does, an alternative of life or death, an authoritative code of morals, a law with inflexible sanctions, a Gospel to be rejected on peril of eternal damnation.

These shallow philanthropists and religionists are as ignorant of the nature of man, as they are of the revelation of God; as little versed in the more imposing features of our constitution, as in the high and solemn themes of Christianity. They have little to do with the deeper wants of our moral being. They do not understand how curious and almost contradictory a piece of workmanship is man. They seem never to have imagined, that he has the closest relations to a moral law, to an atoning Saviour, to a righteous moral Governor, and to an impartial judgment-seat.

Equally ignorant are they of the bonds which hold society together. Much of the doctrine which is industriously promulgated at the present day, tends to form a counterfeit

philanthropy; to make men sympathize with the misfortunes of the criminal, rather than with injured virtue, or with public morals; to weaken the arm of the law, and reduce government itself into a compact remarkable for nothing but its weakness.

HEBREW POETRY.*

Aside from the fact that Hebrew poetry forms part of an inspired book, it has points of attraction to every man who feels any interest in literature, or in the condition of the human race in past ages. This poetry is indeed small in amount. It is all found in the compass of one volume. The words of the language in which it is written, so far as that language has come down to us, are said to amount to only five thousand six hundred and forty-two, while the words in the Greek language exceed eighty thousand.

The Hebrew poetry has also suffered somewhat, in the view of many, from its being found where it is, from its being associated with systems of divinity, or with the warring tenets of different religious sects. It is well enough for theologians and Christians to be familiar with it, but it is out of the circle of general literature; it is found in an unclassical language; it has little to do with modern culture.

But poetry, certainly, does not cease to be such, though its authors are the subjects of Divine inspiration. There are compositions in the Hebrew Scriptures, which, if they

* This is one of the lectures delivered by Professor Edwards before the Junior Class of Andover Theological Seminary.

were not inspired, if they were not in the sacred books, and were not thus secure of an immortality, would be as imperishable as the imagination of man. They relate to affections which are common to the race, and pertain to themes which are of perpetual interest. They emanate from "the gift and faculty divine," which belongs only to the few masters. They constitute a storehouse of sublime and beautiful conceptions, which are native only in the soil of true poetry.

The fact that these poems are inspired, should only increase our interest in them. By thus having the sanction of the Omniscient Mind, their value is immeasurably augmented as mere literary productions or works of art. In the first place, emanating as they do from the fountain of knowledge, there are, consequently, new truths, conceptions previously unknown, fields of thought which a mere human vision could never have explored. As subjects of Divine inspiration, the prophets were often in that highly excited state of the feelings, when fresh trains of thought and lofty imagery would be suggested to them. In the second place, the poetry is in this way preserved from all which is mean or repulsive, unworthy or pernicious. The highest moral purity pervades it, a crystal clearness distinguishes it from much of the discolored poetry of earth. It is even dignified and elevating. Its aim is utility. Its main object is not to please the ear, or gratify the curiosity, or enlarge the intellect. Its primary design was to convey impressive lessons in relation to God, our duties to Him; to awaken within us feelings of love and adoration.

A part of our interest in the poems of Homer arises from their antiquity. They are treasures which seem to have floated down from a patriarchal age, so simple, so unpre-

tending. Yet we have a fragment of Hebrew poetry which is at least two thousand years older than Homer. A stanza or two have survived the ruins of the old world. Miriam, the sister of Moses and Aaron, led the choral song on the shore of the Red Sea, six hundred years before Homer was born. Some branches of Hebrew poetry had reached their highest perfection, two centuries before the war with Troy was sung. The strains of Deborah and Barak are a model of a hymn of triumph, composed seven or eight hundred years before Pindar. Neither Theocritus nor Virgil ever composed so sweet a pastoral as that contained in the book of Ruth, ages earlier than they. We can hardly fail, therefore, to feel an earnest interest in productions, which transport us to the infancy of our race, and compared with which Greek and Roman poetry are of modern invention.

The poetry of the Hebrews connects us with the Oriental world. It unlocks the Asiatic mind. It unseals the literature of tribes that lived in the ancient seats of civilization, from which Egypt, and India, and Germany alike derived their languages and the germs of their arts and sciences. We see the human mind under a new aspect. We are introduced to fresh forms of society, to customs and manners totally unlike ours. It is not the conventional literature of Europe, the formal epics or pastorals which are framed according to the measuring-lines of academies, or the canons of art; but it has the freshness of the primeval morning, the exulting vigor of the mountain gazelle. It may have, in the eye of the critic, great positive faults; still it breathes the freedom of the sons of the desert; the unstudied grace, the guileless simplicity, which we shall look for in vain in the Occidental poet, unless he has been aided in attaining them by this Divine original. May not a new class of im-

ages and associations please us? May not an enlargement of our knowledge beyond the circle of European thought, be attended with benefit?

Hebrew poetry is specially connected with the Arabic. Some of the finest of the Arabian poems were transcribed in characters of gold, on Egyptian paper, and hung up in the temple of Mecca, and were hence called "golden" and "suspended."

We should certainly be in no danger of confounding these poems of the children of the desert with the songs of Schiller, or the sonnets of Milton; yet they constantly remind one of the Song of Solomon, of some of the Proverbs and Psalms. The spirit of these productions may be foreign from that which pervades our poetry; much of the metaphorical language may not be in accordance with European taste; yet still these poems may be original, strongly conceived, and expressed with great life and power. The serenity of the summer nights, and the splendor of the moon and stars, induce the Orientals to recline on the flat roofs of their houses, where they note the varying appearances of the heavens with remarkable precision. Traces of these night observations, allusions to the starry phenomena, are largely incorporated into all the poetry of the East. The nineteenth Psalm, beginning, —

> "The heavens are telling the glory of God,
> And the work of his hands proclaims the firmament;
> Day unto day gushes out with song,
> And night unto night breathes forth knowledge," —

is only one of many specimens which Hebrew poetry exhibits of allusions to these celestial phenomena. Some of the proverbs of Solomon are at this moment rehearsed among the turbaned circles at the gates of Mecca and

Mosul, or under the black tents of the Koords, reminding us that the Hebrew poetry was composed under the open sky, or beneath a herdsman's lodge, or by the weeping willows in Babylon.

The western and central regions of Asia are becoming, more and more, objects of interest to Christendom. As points of attraction in Europe are diminishing, or as the fields of study for the traveller there are exhausted, he turns with new zeal to the yet marvellous shores of Western Asia. Old dynasties there are crumbling in pieces. The successors of the Caliphs are controlled by European diplomacy. One of the effects of the infusion of Western mind will be a more exact acquaintance with the remains of Asiatic literature, with all which can illustrate the history of these venerable lands. Fresh light will be thrown on the relics of Hebrew lore. The strains of David and Isaiah may receive a new authentication. Many passages may be clearly unfolded, which are now made obscure by their condensed brevity, or by some ill-understood geographical reference.

Again, Hebrew poetry has exerted and is now exerting more influence than the poetry of any other nation. It is coextensive with the languages of the civilized world. How widely, for example, are the English conquests carrying the English translation of the Bible! The sweet lyrist of Israel has penetrated further than Alexander of Macedon. His odes are now sung in the vale of Cashmire, and at English firesides halfway up the Himmaleh Mountains. The Scotch bugler, as he picks up the Greek coin in old Bactria, comforts his exile with the Psalm-singing from the version of the Covenanters. The extension of the English language, to which no limits can now be set, will, in a great variety of ways, perpetuate the influence of the Scriptures.

But this poetry is not only diffused through versions and paraphrases; it is incorporated into the poetic literature of the whole Christian world. It supplies the seeds of thought, the suggestive hints, the little germs, the dim conceptions, the outlines of some of the sublimest poems, or passages in poems, to be found in modern literature. It is the fountain-head whither the great masters of song have always repaired. A separate essay has been written to prove how much Shakspeare was indebted to the Scriptures. One of the most original poems in any language is the Faerie Queene of Spenser, wonderful for its inventions, its singular fancies, its adventurous stories. Still, in many places, it is easy to perceive the influence of the Scriptures on the imagination of Spenser. The Red Cross Knight is the Christian of the last chapter of the Ephesians, armed with the panoply of the Gospel. Speaking of Milton, Wordsworth says: "However imbued the surface might be with classical literature, he was a Hebrew in soul, and all things in him tended towards the sublime." If his epic shall endure as long as the language in which it was written, it will be greatly owing to his inspired prototypes, who suggested or aided his adventurous song. If time does not crumble the adamant of Shakspeare, it must be ascribed in a considerable degree to the same cause. The Messiah of Pope is only a paraphrase of some passages in Isaiah. The highest strains of Cowper in his Task are but an expansion of a chapter of the same prophet. In the Thanatopsis of Bryant, the lines,

> "Thou shalt lie down with patriarchs of the infant world,
> With kings, the powerful of the earth, the wise, the good,"

remind us at once of the words of Job:

"For now I should have slept and been quiet,
I should have lain down and been at rest,
With kings and counsellors of the earth,
Who built up splendid palaces for themselves,
Or with princes who had gold,
Who filled their houses with silver."

Lord Byron's celebrated poem on Darkness, —

"The bright sun was extinguished, and the stars
Did wander darkling in the eternal space, —
. . . . . .
Morn came and went, and came, and brought no day," —

was evidently founded on a passage in Jeremiah :

"I looked at the earth, and lo! emptiness and desolation ;
At the heavens, and there was no light.
I saw the mountains, and lo! they trembled ;
The hills, and they were shaken.
I beheld, and there was no man,
And every bird of the heavens had fled."

In short, it would be impossible to estimate the influence of the Bible on the poetic literature of all the Christian nations. This influence is creative, suggestive, incorporated with our earliest education and recollections, ever distilling, like the gentle dew and rain.

I will now proceed to consider Hebrew poetry under two heads : first, its external form ; secondly, its essential characteristics.

I. What is the outward form of Hebrew poetry? In what manner does it differ from prose ?

First, not in respect to rhyme. There may be occasionally some slight tendencies towards the recurrence of similar sounds at the close of the members of a verse, but with the possible exception of a few proverbs or apothegms,

this rhyme is accidental, or is owing to the fact that the terminations of many verbs and nouns are necessarily alike. Rhyme seems to be foreign to the genius of the ancient Hebrew poetry. It would offend against its simple majesty and depth of feeling.

Secondly, the sacred poetry does not differ from prose by any metrical arrangement. The Hebrew knows nothing of prosody in the Greek and Roman sense. Ingenious and laborious efforts have been made to restore a metrical arrangement, which, as it is argued, has been lost. But these attempts have been altogether fruitless. Indeed, the very idea involves some degree of absurdity. It implies a scientific culture among the ancient Hebrews which did not exist. They possessed no learned schools, no settled standard of taste, no dialect like the Attic, capable of being moulded just as a delicate ear or a fastidious taste might prompt. The free spirit of an old Hebrew would scorn to have his thoughts subjected to a severe criticism, or made obedient to the nice laws of euphony. The Hebrew language is almost totally destitute of the light and abundant vocalization, and with it the alternation of long and short syllables, necessary for a metrical arrangement, being in this respect far behind the Arabic. The cognate Syriac has learned to limit the verse to a definite number of syllables, but it is unable to distinguish the syllables internally as to quantity, as the Arabic does. It can merely form them into a kind of rhythm, by means of a certain trochaic fall, or change of voice. In such languages as the Greek, Sanscrit, and Arabic, possessing a beautiful alternation of long and short syllables, the rhythm extends its influence from the whole down to every single syllable of the verse-member. In them a metre regulates all syllables equally.

But this pure metrical or mathematical rhythm is entirely foreign to the Hebrew.*

How then is the poetry of the Old Testament distinguished from the prose?

First, the later poetry, particularly, is distinguished by the somewhat frequent use of figures or devices, such as the paronomasia, alliteration, regular succession of the same letters, and other mnemonic helps. The prophet Nahum has these words, בּוּקָה וּמְבוּקָה וּמְבֻלָקָה, equivalent to the English *destruction*, *devastation*, *desolation*. Isaiah has many of these plays upon words; e. g. הוֹי גוֹי, לַעֲרֹץ הָאָרֶץ, like the Latin *terreat terram*, German *erhebt*, *hebt*; מִשְׁפָּח צְעָקָה צְדָקָה, מִשְׁפָּט, like the German *Blutbad*, *Gutthat*, *Bedrückung*, *Beglückung*. In this last case there is the same number of syllables, and a kind of metrical harmony.

The hundred and nineteenth Psalm is divided into twenty-two portions, each of which begins with a successive letter of the Hebrew alphabet. The verses in three chapters of the Lamentations commence in the same way. In one chapter, containing sixty-six verses, the first three verses begin with the first letter of the alphabet, the next three with the second, and so on. Some of the Psalms have a kind of refrain or chorus, a single verse or sentiment being repeated after certain intervals of equal or of unequal length.

Secondly, the poetic language of the Hebrews is more elevated, animated, exuberant, than the prosaic, has a more stately march, retains more antique terms, and in general suffers less change. Much that is peculiar to the poetic language was evidently preserved by tradition from primitive poems which we cannot now trace. Many archaic words

* See Ewald on Hebrew Poetry.

which prose has lost are retained by the poets, and a considerable number of fuller and more euphonious forms are only preserved in verse. "Bold combinations in the proposition, emphatic collocation of words, and sententious brevity in the diction, are the especial indications of the poet's mastery over the language." "The poet," Ewald remarks, "may more freely and easily allow the divergent shades and materials of the language of his immediate home and of his own time to mingle in his diction; and while prose is slow to alter a form which has once been established, the poetic language constantly enriches itself, and renews its youth, by adopting dialectical peculiarities which have not been admitted into the prevailing prose, and by the introduction of elements from the popular idiom, which always possesses a richer variety." *

Thirdly, but the great, characteristic mark of Hebrew poetry, in respect to form, consists in what is termed Parallelism, or, by Ewald, verse-rhythm. The words of the poet do not flow out in a long, uninterrupted, uniform series, as in prose, where the great object is perspicuity, but they divide themselves into symmetrical members, according to the degree of the poet's feeling. The diction has a kind of rise and fall, leaping up and receding, a modulated, graceful motion. That the voice ascends in the first member, and is more tranquil in the second, is sometimes indicated by the accent; e. g. Judges v. 12, עוּרִי עוּרִי,

"Up thén, up thén, Deborá!
Úp then, úp then, útter the song!"

There is something similar to this in the speeches of the American Indians. They are accustomed to declaim in

* Ewald.

short sentences, with some approach towards rhythm, constantly reinforcing a sentiment by repeating it in the same or in different language, or by denying the opposite:

"If the white man ever entered Logan's cabin hungry, and he gave him no meat;
If ever he came cold and naked, and he clothed him not —"

This swell and ebb, violent or graceful alternation, seems to have its origin in the nature of poetry, especially that which is simple and original, and to constitute a kind of imperfect substitute for metre or rhyme.

It is not, however, confined to a mere rise and fall. New variations and modifications come from this fundamental principle. The variation may be a mere continuation or amplification of the fundamental rhythm; or it may be called a composition; i. e. a rhythm, complete in itself, is yet treated only as a half, and made to refer to a new half, and thus a larger, more complicated and diversified rhythm is produced; or there may be a diminution or enfeebling of the rhythm. These variations in the rhythm of Hebrew poetry are very many and diversified. They are, —

1st. What is called synonymous parallelism. In many cases the same sense which has been poured forth in a complete proposition in the first member, rises up again in the second, in order to render itself more impressive, or exhaust itself more perfectly. The second member is not a mere empty repetition, but often adds completeness and force:

"Hear, my son, the reproof of thy father,
And neglect not the law of thy mother."

Frequently, a main part of the sense of the first member is further unfolded in the second: —

"Who laid its measures, that thou knowest?
Or who stretched over it the line?"

The mere alternation of the perfect and imperfect tenses often produces an agreeable variation, or, when the same word is repeated, its connection is often changed.

2d. The second species has been named, though inadequately, the synthetic parallelism or rhythm. "It is a less animated, more sluggish rhythm; the sentence, being too long for one member, is obliged to trail itself through two":

"The Lord at thy right hand
Smites kings in the day of his wrath."

"In the *synonymous* parallelism, at every new member, there is a step or half-step backward again, in order to set out a second time, with more force, from what has been already said; but in the synthetic parallelism, there is a direct advance"; * there is not so much an iteration as a progression in the thought.

3d. What has been termed the antithetic parallelism, though that word embraces only a part of what is included in the idea. Of the two parallel sentences, one is not merely an echo of the other, nor an expansion or accessory of the other, but the two are antithetical; one affirms by a negation what the other asserts in a positive form, or they have the form of protasis and apodosis, or one expresses the ground or comparison of the other; for example:

"A gentle heart is the life of the body,
But jealousy is a canker to the bones"

"If I were hungry I would not tell thee,
For the world is mine and the fulness thereof."

Sometimes the protasis and apodosis are at the same time divided in the two members:

* Ewald.

"They complain, but there is none to help;
To Jehovah, but he answers them not."

At the same time, it should be remarked, that, while this threefold division is obviously correct and important, yet there are many passages where the distinctions are not accurately observed; the three kinds run into each other. In short, along with the observance of a general law, the poet enjoyed great freedom in respect to external form; his free spirit moulded his language.

As an instance of the freedom which was practised, we may take the first Psalm. In the first verse there are three clauses, and in the second two clauses, which correspond nearly in sense, and serve to exhaust the idea. In the third verse we find the leading thought of the Psalm; then the thought is carried forward in the three following clauses, so that the last expresses in a literal manner what the first two had communicated in a figurative way.

Some of the Hebrew poetry is constructed so as to be sung in a responsive manner, or like the antiphonies which were chanted in the time of Ambrose in the cathedral at Milan. The twenty-fourth Psalm may have been sung in a festival procession of the Levites, as they drew near the ancient hill of Zion; though some think it was composed in reference to the anticipated dedication of Solomon's temple. The advancing procession begin:

"Who shall ascend the hill of Jehovah,
And who shall stand in his holy place?"

A company within the temple, or on the top of the mount, respond:

"The clean of hands and the pure of heart,
Who hath not lifted up to a falsehood his soul,
And hath not sworn to a lie."

Again the slowly moving throng, as they draw near the high and massive portals, exclaim:

"Lift up, ye gates, your heads,
And be ye lifted up, eternal doors,
That the King of glory may enter."

Again is heard from within, or from the summit:

"Who is this King of glory?"

The response instantly returns:

"Jehovah, strong and mighty,
Jehovah, mighty in battle."

The summons is heard once more:

"Lift up, ye gates, your heads,
And lift ye up, doors of eternity,
That the King of glory may enter."

Again the question rings:

"Who is this King of glory?"

As the pageant crosses the threshold, the final response is given:

"Jehovah, God of hosts,
He is the King of glory."

Our next inquiry relates to the *classification* of Hebrew poetry. Can it be arranged into specific divisions, like the Epic, Dramatic, Pastoral, and Descriptive poetry of the Greeks? Some have called the Pentateuch an epic; the poem of Job, a drama or an epic; Ecclesiastes, a philosophical poem, like that of Lucretius, or Pope's Essay on Man; Solomon's Song, an idyl; the Lamentations, an elegy.

But it is evident at first sight, that the Hebrew poetry will not tolerate any such artificial distinction. The poet would feel the same repugnance to a scientific arrangement of this nature, that he would to the shackles of rhyme

or metre. His song comes out from his own imaginative nature. He does not sit down thoughtfully, like Milton or Wordsworth, to construct an epic or an ode. The fire burns in his breast, and it must flame forth. His dearest friend is slain in battle. His feelings naturally take an elegiac form :

> " Gazelle of Israel, slain on thy mountains !
> Very dear wast thou to me;
> Wonderful was thy love to me,
> Passing the love of women."

The poet happens to be on Lebanon in a storm ; the blue Mediterranean is open before him, and his feelings prompt the lofty lyric :

> " Jehovah is on the mighty waters ;
> The God of glory thundereth ;
> The voice of Jehovah divideth the flames of fire."

The sight of flocks lying on the green grass, or drinking from the rivulet under the watchful eye of the good shepherd, gives to his thoughts a sweet, pastoral simplicity :

> " Jehovah is my shepherd ;
> I shall not want."

At another time, the wonders of ancient story, how Jehovah made all the powers of nature work in behalf of his chosen people, led him to say :

> " It is a pleasant thing
> To make mention in the morning of thy mercy,
> And of thy faithfulness in the night,
> On a ten-stringed harp, and on a lyre,
> With the murmuring sounds of the harp."

From these examples we may see how the *occasion* classified the poetry. The lyric element, or the pastoral,

or the elegiac, characterizes the production, according to the state of the poet's feelings, or his outward circumstances. Yet he would not be confined to either of these, or to any other form. Light suddenly shone on the darkness of his soul, and the moaning elegy passes in a moment into the loftiest song of triumph. The book of Psalms is often termed a lyrical anthology; yet no small part of it is in the tardily moving didactic style, hardly differing from prose, except in the recurrence of the parallelism and the position of the accents. So the book of Isaiah contains not less than half a dozen distinct species of poetry, sometimes within the compass of two or three chapters.

If Hebrew poetry will admit of any classification, the best arrangement, perhaps, is into Lyric and Didactic.

1. Lyrical Poetry. "This species of poetry," says Ewald, "is universally the first kind which arises among any people. It is so according to its nature; for it is the daughter of the moment, of sudden feelings, of deep and fiery emotions. It is so in point of time also; the short lyric is the most permanent, imperishable part of poetry, the first and the last effusion of the poetic mood, like an indestructible fountain, which may at any time begin to flow afresh; it is therefore, of necessity, the oldest kind of poetry among all nations, and the one which first establishes a poetic art and form, and paves the way for all other kinds of poetry. If *epic* poetry was, in certain nations, committed to writing at an earlier period than lyrical, it does not follow that the lyrical arose, as to its primary elements, later than the epic. The earliest beginnings of lyrical poetry may have vanished without leaving a trace behind." "Suddenness of emotion and of act, intensity and vivacity of simple and irrepressible feel-

ings, the highest tension and rapid fall of the imagination, — these are the peculiarities of the Semitic nations, lyrical poets by birth, not epic." "Lyrical poetry has the widest and most manifold compass, drawing into its sphere every gush of thought and emotion, and ascending from the briefest snatches of song, up to great hymns of victory and praise." It lives and moves in feeling. It cannot exist in mere thought. A process of reflection would be fatal to it. The only intellectual power with which it deeply sympathizes, is the imagination.

An essential peculiarity of lyrical poetry is in the form. It presupposes the song to be melodized, to be both sung and played. Those songs which were not adapted for musical performance were evidently imitations of an established pattern. The distinctive title of a lyric song is מִזְמוֹר, which occurs in the inscriptions of the larger number of Psalms. It is translated by the Septuagint ψαλμός, from ψάλλειν, to touch or strike the strings. It corresponds more exactly, however, to μέλος, a melodious song, to be sung to some musical instrument. The word מַשְׂכִּיל probably means a judicious or skilful melodious song, — a song to be performed with nice musical skill.

The meaning of the word מִכְתָּם, which occurs in the titles to six Psalms, is unknown. It has been conjectured that it comes from כָּתַם, like כָּתֻם, and means golden, a rarer species, the best lyric song.

The lyric song may be divided into a number of species, of which the principal are the following: —

1st. תְּהִלָּה, hymn, a song of joy, triumph, gratitude, performed by the whole congregation, solemnly sung in the temple, composed with especial care, and the most imposing of all lyric productions, in solemn processions accom-

panied with dancing as well as music. The hymn sung on the shore of the Red Sea, the triumphal hymn of Deborah and Barak, the numerous temple songs, the Hallelujah Psalms, songs of praise to Jehovah as the God of nature and nations, are specimens.

2d. The second subdivision is the קִינָה, *θρῆνος*, a dirge, often beginning with an exclamation of grief, as אוֹ, *oh! ah!* and probably distinguished by peculiar melody and instruments. Heroes and beloved friends were celebrated with such elegies. Songs of mourning for the calamities of the country gradually received this name; e. g. Psalms xliv., lx., lxxiii. Jeremiah at last unites all possible mourning and lamentation in a large and skilfully constructed book on the fall of Jerusalem.

3d. The idyl, Psalm xlv., is inscribed שִׁיר יְדִידֹת, song of loves, describing, under the image of an Oriental wedding, the glories of the Messiah's reign.

There is great similarity between this production and Solomon's Song, the latter being a full and beautiful development of what is in the former wrapped up in a germ. There is in the latter the addition of a dramatic element. The change of the chief persons in the dialogue is very simple. A maiden called the Shulamite is the chief speaker; next to her, King Solomon and a chorus of women at his court play the principal parts. In the subordinate scenes some other persons appear. "The treatment of the subject is artlessly lovely and charming, and has a sublime ease and simplicity."

4th. Miscellaneous, — songs in which there is satire, pungent irony, as Psalms xiv., lviii., lxxxii.; songs expressing isolated impressions and sentiments, short descriptions, depicting with lyric fervor some momentous experience or

beautiful sights; e. g. Psalms xxiv., xxvi., cxxxi., cxxxii.; and prayers, תְּהִלָּה. In some of the Psalms, however, with this inscription, only the general tendency or remote aim would justify the application of prayer to them.

2. Didactic Poetry. The other great division is Didactic, or what Ewald terms Gnomic Poetry. "A calmer movement, moderation, and tranquil attention to proportion, prevail in the diction, and the composition is not in general to be accompanied by song and music; but the elevated sentiment adopts the beautiful form which poetry has once sanctioned, because it is the one which adequately corresponds to it." The didactic poet is distinguished from the prophet by this, that he does not appear publicly before the people, nor aim to produce a momentary impression as an orator. This kind of poetry among the Hebrews evidently commenced with Solomon. It was the period of peace, extended commerce, art, reflection, when the poet could gather up the experiences of the past, and embody them in pithy sayings, sharp apothegms, instructive allegories, or spread them out in a kind of philosophical disquisition.

Didactic poetry includes, first, the popular proverbs, containing instruction or confirming a truth, with great point and brevity. Every short, pithy verse forms a whole, contains a complete sense by itself, and may be applied at pleasure. It includes, secondly, longer pieces, of an admonitory, oratorical tone, comparisons and metaphors worked out at length, sometimes with a dramatic interchange of dialogue. Sometimes a piece of this kind might combine a lyrical element, and might be even arranged to music. Finally, we have in the book of Ecclesiastes a kind of philosophical discussion, where the search after

truth is gone into, the doubts of objectors are admitted, and where the author, as a moralist, lays down in proverbial sentences the practical maxims which should be observed.

The book of Job does not appear to come exactly into either of the two great divisions of Hebrew poetry. It has epic features. It has a beginning, middle, end. It has the unities of time, place, and subject. It has its centre, — one great thought, around which all others revolve. It has much of the charm of a lively drama. The six or eight characters which appear in it have marked, characteristic differences. The book has great resemblance to a Greek tragedy, e. g. the Philoctetes of Sophocles. Again, it is a wonderful composition for its lyrical feeling. In pathos, in lofty flights of imagination, in delicate imagery, it takes a very high rank. Then it has brief, sententious proverbs, sometimes extending into lengthened exhortations and highly wrought descriptions. It may also be viewed under the light of an earnest, philosophical discussion, propounding an important and most difficult theological problem ; viz. Why is it that a perfect Being permits the good on earth to be so afflicted, and the wicked to be happy ? The book exhibits the highest reach of all Hebrew poetry and art.

II. I now proceed to describe some of the principal internal characteristics of Hebrew poetry, some of the distinguishing peculiarities in the thought or subject-matter.

The first which I will name is, that it is Oriental. Were we ignorant of the native place of the writers, we should recognize on every page of their productions an Oriental cast of thought. There are no traces of cultivation, science, or of refined philosophical speculation, of calm reflection or of logical deduction. In spirit and in imagery, it is essen-

tially Eastern. It abounds in unexpected personifications, in apostrophes which might be almost called audacious, in allegories that are often carried almost to the verge of extravagance.

The Arabian poet describes the rose as pale from envy at seeing the vermilion tint of the beautiful Zerab ; the jasmine reddens from rage at beholding the whiteness of her complexion ; the nightingale is silent from despair as he listens to a song sweeter than his own. In like manner the Hebrew poet inquires :

> " Who is she that looketh forth like the morning ?
> Fair as the moon, clear as the sun,
> Terrible as an army in battle array ? "

A search is made through all the realms of nature, a tax is laid on all visible objects, to furnish comparisons which will heighten her beauty and make her the object of universal admiration.

The Arabian poet calls precipitation the mother of repentance ; the traveller, the son of the road ; words, the daughters of the lips ; prudence, the daughter of reflection. The Hebrew names singing-women the daughters of song ; smelling-bottles, the daughters of perfume ; branches, the daughters of a tree.

The descriptions of favorite animals form a considerable part of Oriental poetry. The Arabian, when he would interest us in the timid gazelle, frightened by the sight of the hunters and the cry of their hounds, portrays the softness and mildness of her eye, the delicacy and gracefulness of her neck, the whiteness of her skin, and the quivering of her limbs, exhausted with fatigue. In words relating to the animal creation, the Arabic language is wonderfully copious. It has sometimes been denominated the camel

language, it has so many references to that animal. It has been said to have five hundred names or epithets for the lion, and two hundred for serpents.

The delineation of the horse, the hawk, the eagle, the hippopotamus, in the book of Job, are precisely such as would captivate the Bedaween or the Koords of the present day.

Mr. Layard, author of the researches at Nineveh, mentions that an Arab sheikh of his acquaintance was the owner of a horse of matchless beauty. Her dam, who died about ten years before, was the celebrated Kubleh, whose renown extended from the sources of the Khabour to the end of the Arabian promontory, and the day of whose death is the epoch from which the Arabs of Mesopotamia now date the events concerning their tribe.

The highest ideas of happiness in the mind of an Oriental are associated with freshness and verdure. It is a maxim among the Arabs, says Sir William Jones, that the three most charming objects in nature are a green meadow, a clear rivulet, and a beautiful woman, and that the view of these three objects at one and the same time affords the greatest delight imaginable. Hebrew poetry was written in a country where rain and living fountains of water are the greatest of earthly blessings. How much of the most beautiful imagery of the prophets is drawn from this source! "A man shall be as an hiding-place from the wind, and a covert from the tempest, as rivers of water in a dry place, and as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land." The glorious Jehovah would be, in the consummation of his goodness, like a place of broad rivers and streams. The city seen by John in Apocalyptic vision could not be complete without a pure river of living water, with trees ever green on its banks.

But it is unnecessary to pursue this point further. The entire texture and spirit of Hebrew poetry demonstrate it to be of Asiatic origin. It never could have been written by such men as Virgil or Horace, supposing them to have been Hebrews. It bears the most indubitable marks that it was written in the country where it professes to have been written. It has a stronger resemblance to the poetry of Homer than to that of any other classical author, and he was probably an Asiatic.

The second trait of Hebrew poetry is its wonderful simplicity. It possesses a simplicity, a transparency, a child-like cheerfulness, hardly found elsewhere, a sublime naturalness, which as yet knows little of strict art. "When compared with the poetry of other nations, it appears to belong to a simple, more youthful period of humanity, to gush forth from an inward fulness of emotion and grace of sentiment, and to be not at all concerned about external ornament and strict laws of art." *

The book of Genesis is very attractive on account of this quality, particularly in the original. Its artless, unpretending narratives are inimitable, unless it be in the pages of Homer. A quarto volume was published in 1659, by Professor James Duport of Cambridge, England, a principal object of which is to cite the analogous passages in Homer and the Hebrew Scriptures.

A third characteristic of Hebrew poetry is its vivacity. With whatever deficiencies it is chargeable, no one can complain of its dulness. Its genius, its whole movement, is spirited, perhaps beyond that of any Occidental poetry. This is owing to several causes.

---

* Ewald.

The language is full of life. Its entire structure is remarkably fitted for lyrical effect. The verb, adapted to express every variety of action and passion, contains the substance of the language. It is developed in some respects more fully than any Western dialect. The verb is wonderfully expressive. The number of adjectives and abstract nouns is extremely small. And these are mostly derived from verbs, or are themselves infinitives, and partake of the living nature of their root. In the English language the great number of particles is a serious impediment to the free movement of poetry. Prepositions and other connectives impart logical precision to a sentence, but it is at the expense of its fire and energy. The Hebrew particles are very few, and some of them exhibit a doubly compound relation, and thus greatly contribute to the vivacity of a sentence.

Again, the poet was not educated in the schools. A life of cloistered meditation was unknown to him. His days were crowded with great events. David, from the time of his conflict with the Philistine till his death, had scarcely a moment of rest. He poured forth his plaintive songs when hunted as a partridge on the mountains, in a cave watched by his unrelenting foe, or when driven from his throne, an exile beyond Jordan, or when marching at the head of a victorious army. Consequently, his imagery would be that of external nature, colored by the deep and varied emotions of his heart. The prominent objects in Palestine would strongly arrest his attention, and everywhere reappear in his poems. The case was not materially different with other great poets. Habakkuk seems to have written amid the horrors of a Chaldean invasion. Jeremiah was in Jerusalem when it was taken by the Babylonians.

He poured forth his wailing notes as he wandered over the ashes of Solomon's temple, amid sounds and sights that would have agonized a heart less tender than his own. The restless life of the poet is, therefore, a principal cause of the choice of his figures and of the impetuous movement of his verse. One conversant with the sterner exhibitions of outward nature, or harassed by conflicting emotions, would naturally adopt a vivacious diction.

Again, the lively style is in part owing to the condensed brevity of many of the poems. Some of the writers would seem almost to make it an object to use as few words as possible. The burdened heart would not allow them to stop fully to express the idea. Their spiritual vision darted too rapidly from object to object, to permit them to linger on the mere costume of the thought. The entire books of Nahum, Hosea, Micah, Habakkuk, and some of the Psalms, are written in an exceedingly abrupt and condensed style. The hundred and tenth Psalm includes a kind of epic poem in seven verses, much more being left to the imagination of the reader than is expressed in words.

A fourth marked characteristic of the Hebrew Muse is pathos. Perhaps this point can be best illustrated by a comparison with Greek poetry. The causes of the superiority of the Hebrew can be shown in a number of particulars. The Jew had a warmer affection for his native land than the Greek. The latter was restless, aspiring, disposed to seek his fortunes wherever he could find them, — an exact prototype of a large part of our own population, ever in search for some new Dorado. Greek colonies voluntarily established themselves in Bactria, almost on the western borders of China. Our interest in Xenophon's Retreat of the Ten Thousand is greatly weakened towards the close,

when we see the indifference of the soldiers in relation to their old home. But the Jew would not leave his native soil till he was torn from it; he had little curiosity to tempt him away, every inducement to stay at home. This rooted attachment to the hills and valleys of the Holy Land is inwrought into much of his poetry.

Again, the Jew had purer and stronger domestic affections than the Greek. This is owing greatly to the fact, that the Hebrew possessed the true religion, while the mythology and political institutions of the Greeks exerted in many respects a debasing influence on the social character. The direct tendency of the laws of Lycurgus was to merge the family in the State. No matter what became of the household, if the Commonwealth flourished. The social state was no better in Athens. There was little to choose between the slave and the free woman. The twenty thousand freemen lived in public almost exclusively. They were on board the ships, or strolling in the market, or in the walks of the Lyceum and the Acádemy. Pure domestic feeling, as a general thing, did not exist. Of course the national poetry must suffer.

The religion of the Hebrews was fitted to awaken intense emotions. It presented the true God to the Hebrew in such a light, as to elicit feelings to which the Greek was a stranger. A poet who could pen the fifty-first Psalm must have possessed a soul of the deepest susceptibility and tenderness. The tide of emotion will rise in accordance with the elevation and profoundness of the thought. If the Hebrew was admitted to a higher region of conception, his emotions would in a great measure correspond.

The question discussed in the book of Job is one of the most difficult in theological science. Why does not a just

God treat men in the present life according to their character? Why does vice so often go unpunished? Job's friends cut the knot by denying the fact. To uphold their side of the question, they misrepresented the general experience of man. Job felt the difficulty, but could not solve it. He was fully conscious of his own integrity, and he could not see why he was visited with such unparalleled sufferings. To the depth of emotion consequent on the discussion of this theological question, the whole compass of Greek poetry, perhaps, supplies no parallel. The wretched fortunes of Œdipus or Medea could not possibly create such a conflict.

> "My face is red with weeping,
> And on my eyelashes is the shadow of death,
> Not for any violence in my hands,
> And my prayer is pure;
> O earth, cover not my blood,
> And let there be no place to hide my cry!"

The eighty-eighth Psalm is a specimen of elegiac painting of inconsolable sorrow, with which but few compositions can be compared. The Lamentations of Jeremiah are remarkable for unaffected pathos, for sorrow delicately expressed and that refuses to be comforted. The passages in Greek poetry which approach nearest to them in pathos are the elegies of Tyrtæus, a scene in Œdipus Coloneus, where the blind old man complains to his heart-stricken daughter, and scenes in the Iliad which describe the death of Priam, or the grief of Achilles for Patroclus.

The fifth marked characteristic of Hebrew poetry is sublimity. In the quality of beauty, especially in all which regards the form, Greek poetry has doubtless the advantage. Greece has a finer climate than Palestine. The

country is so situated in the north temperate zone, defended by mountains on its north, interlocked and elegantly variegated by seas and islands, as to produce a temperature cold enough to brace the intellect without benumbing it, and warm enough to call into play the finer affections of the soul, without wasting its energies in a soft effeminacy. All the literary productions of the Greeks, the poetry particularly, bear witness to the purity and elasticity of the atmosphere.

The Greek language, too, is far better fitted for a graceful literature than the Hebrew. It is more flexible, probably, than any other dialect ever spoken by man. It is most exactly fitted to those who were said to be born with a love of beautiful forms and sweet sounds. The love for beauty among the Greeks was cultivated to an extraordinary degree. In an old ode, ascribed to Simonides, the first of the four wishes was to be healthy, the second to be beautiful, the third to be rich honestly, the fourth to be gay and merry with one's friends. Beauty was an excellence which led to fame; every beautiful person sought to be known. Some persons were characterized by a particular name, derived from some beautiful part of the body; e. g. Demetrius Poliorcetes was called, from the beauty of his eyelids, Χαριτοβλέφαρος, on whose lids the Graces dwell. At Sparta, Lesbos, Parrhasia, the women contended for the prize of beauty. The Hebrew has so many gutturals, sibilants, and other harsh letters, as to make the enunciation rather grating and monotonous.

Another important circumstance was, that the Jews were intended to be a religious people, not a commercial or a literary community, but to act as a depositary of the Divine Word. A variety of expedients were adopted to

exclude all articles of luxury and extravagance. The later prophets utter frequent complaints against a voluptuous style of house architecture, music, and living, which was creeping in at Samaria and Jerusalem. It is hardly necessary to say how totally unlike were the Greeks. All things conspired to make them a nation of beautiful artists and highly cultivated poets and scholars; of course, their poetry would possess a grace, a flexibility, a finer texture and outward form, than any Oriental poetry could aspire to.

But in regard to sublimity the circumstances were different. Though Palestine is not so beautiful a country as Greece, yet it is better fitted to awaken emotions of grandeur. One can stand on Lebanon, and over the level bosom of the Mediterranean see the sun setting without an intervening object. The same sun, rising over the wide desert south of Judea, awakens a peculiar class of emotions, with which nothing Grecian can be compared. Tempests, thunder, lightning, have a more terrible commission to perform in Palestine than in Greece.

Again, the Hebrew poets are more entirely the children of nature. They may sometimes offend against what Voltaire or Lord Chesterfield would call good taste. But they are sure to rise higher than the fastidiously cultivated Athenian. Their figures are bolder, the current of their thought more impetuous, their aspirations freer, than would have been possible, if they had been thinking of the laws of harmony or of the canons of taste. The parallelism is peculiarly the product of nature. It could rise suddenly into a climax, or array one member against another in the sharpest antithesis, or it would admit of a continued series of the boldest personifications. What made the Greek a beautiful poet, detracted to a certain extent from his lyrical power.

But the great, inestimable advantage for the Hebrew was his religion. He did not look at the course of nature, as the Greek did, through the medium of an inconsistent or ridiculous mythology. The Jewish history was commenced and carried on in a series of stupendous miracles, so varied, so felt or described, as to fix themselves on the imaginative Hebrew to the latest ages. "The ancient Hebrew poetry was animated by those sublime thoughts, which in such purity, power, and consistency are found nowhere else. Their poetry had no other way to become great and unique, than in this sole tendency to the sublime." Almost the first sentence in the Hebrew Bible struck the heathen critic, Longinus, as unmatched for sublimity; yet this is but one of a thousand with which that Bible abounds. By universal consent, the passages which are sublimest in the Greek poets, are those which make the nearest approach to the Hebrew delineation of God and his attributes. Yet here the mythology comes in to weaken or confuse the impression. That great passage in Homer, where the gods mingle in the conflict, is injured by the incongruity of representing them as visible and tangible objects, while the warrior-angels who were sent to the aid of the prophet Elisha could not be seen except by a supernatural vision.

IMPORTANCE OF A THOROUGH THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION.*

On what mainly does the importance of a thorough and protracted theological education depend? What are the principal grounds on which the propriety of three or four years of study rests?

I. On the extent and difficulty of the subjects included in a course of theological study. The bare statement of this course should seem to be sufficient. It includes in substance an exact knowledge of the meaning of the Bible, an arrangement of its scattered truths into an orderly system, and an acquaintance with the effects which these truths have produced on the human mind and heart in all the countries where they have been made known.

The extent of the subject, and the inherent difficulties of it, may be illustrated in a variety of ways. The Bible is a great and congruous whole. It is eminently characterized by unity of design and symmetry of parts. Yet it is of the most varied and dissimilar contents. It is a series of

* This is one of the Introductory Lectures delivered by Professor Edwards before the three classes of Andover Theological Seminary.

personal narratives fully drawn out, or mixed with itineraries and lists of names; regular poems, interspersed with simple and sublime lyrics; grave histories, followed by familiar letters; sometimes branching out into the profoundest discussions, interrupted by passionate elegiac strains, or by the obscure symbols of the prophet, all variously colored by the changes of four thousand years. Suppose we were required to master a large volume of Greek and Roman literature, — the history of Thucydides, the Odes of Pindar, the epics of Homer, the Dialogues of Plato, the poems of Lucretius, the Letters of Cicero, — would it not require some time and diligent study to comprehend their various contents? Would a year's application do any thing more than effect an entrance into this golden treasure-house? Yet there are those who appear to think that one year of perhaps often-interrupted study, will qualify them to become public expounders of a series of works written during the lapse of two thousand years.

Some of the ablest scholars have spent a large portion of their lives in writing treatises on single Greek words. Volumes have been written on the article. This is not considered lost labor. On the meaning of an insignificant particle turn some of the deepest questions, not only in philology, but in morals and religion. Adequately to explain that particle, demands an intimate acquaintance with the laws and operations of the human mind. And if this is true in the Greek of the classics, how much more is it in that of the New Testament! If a man may lawfully employ a life in tracing out a Greek inscription of five lines on a monument, may he not employ a few months in trying to comprehend some of the truths wrapped up in such words as πίστις, λόγος, δικαιοσύνη, and πνεῦμα? With attempts to unfold their

meaning, church history is crowded; and yet how much undiscovered land remains! Who is able to tell why John made use of the word Logos to describe the incarnate Son? What was the precise idea, as well as the origin of the idea, which he intended to communicate by it? If, therefore, years of the closest study, in the maturest part of a scholar's life, are well spent in detecting shades of thought in a few Latin synonymes, is not longer time and profounder study necessary in examining words which are the hinges of the Christian faith? If the minute, searching investigations, in the former case, which every one justifies, show the extent and difficulty of the subject, do they not show the same in the latter?

Again, theological study *borders* on other subjects of vital importance, and presupposes an acquaintance with them. All truth is not fitted to all minds, or to the same mind in all circumstances. Hence the theological student should know, not only what the human mind is in general, but what are its varieties, its individual weaknesses, the endlessly diversified phases under which it acts. He will be required rightly to divide the word of truth. But how can he do this unless he be familiar with the characteristic differences among his hearers? There are the same original faculties in all, but how greatly are they modified by early defects in education, by afflictions, by external nature, by age, and a thousand other circumstances! Must he not know something of these? Can he otherwise shape his message to the exigencies of his hearers? Must he not have often watched the different effect of Divine truth on his own mind at different times, — what it is which weakens the power of motives, enfeebles the will, obscures the perception, or confounds the judgment? Unless he have something more

than a *general* acquaintance with the movements of his own mind, he will be an unskilful preacher.

The same remarks are applicable to the subjects of ethics and casuistry. These are not necessary parts of theological study. Yet how intimate and various are their relations to it. How large a part of a minister's life is occupied in *carrying out* the great principles of the moral law; in showing the applicability, or the contrary, of a particular rule of duty to a particular case; in pointing out where a justifiable expediency ends, and a criminal conformity to the world begins; and in relieving the perplexed mind, sometimes on points involving the hardest questions of casuistry!

Again, theology not only touches upon profound truths, but it has among them its native home. Like astronomy, it is conversant with the great things of God. Other subjects may comprise some vital truths; but this is the case, in general, according as they approach Christianity. That in Plato and Cicero which interests us most profoundly, pertains to the nature and destiny of the soul. We are not thoroughly absorbed in Virgil, till, in the sixth book, he crosses the barrier of time.

That which attracts us in the Koran is its theology. Amid all its childish incoherences, there are many things which indicate the restlessness of the human spirit, when it has not a consistent religious belief. In the truths of Christian theology, we find that which satisfies our minds when they are most capable of reflection, when they are in a state for the calmest meditation. And in proportion as they are freed from blinding and depressing influences, they will reveal their affinity for theological truth. It is really their only congenial nutriment, that only which meets their deepest aspirations. Can a system, then, of such

wide reach, and of so profound a meaning, be grasped by a desultory effort? Can we apprehend and classify its truths by a few months of study? We are called to investigate questions which *exercised* the understandings of Augustine and Calvin, which attuned the musical soul of Ambrose, which filled the one-windowed cell of Luther at Erfurt with heavenly light, — those hard, yet practical problems, which have tasked the greatest minds of every age. Melancthon, a few days before his death, put down the reasons why he should not be afraid of death. One of these was: "Thou shalt learn those wonderful mysteries which thou couldst not understand in this life, — why we are made as we are, and of what kind is the union of the two natures in Christ."

II. This necessity results from the very nature of the study. It is not the laws of physical science; it is not mere intellectual propositions; it is not *abstract* science, with which we have little *practical* concern; it is *moral* truths, truths vital with salutary influence, for us to observe and derive benefit from *while* we are studying them. There is a twofold process. We are to comprehend them intellectually, and enjoy them spiritually. We cannot understand them fully without taking time to bring our *hearts* into contact with them. The *moral* eye must be single. We must be free from prejudices, prepossessions, from sensual and worldly desires. In other words, we cannot take them up and handle them, as we do mathematical truths, and then dismiss them. They are nutriment to the soul, to be incorporated, as it were, with our moral life. We are to make self-application of them, both for our own immediate moral benefit, and that we may more adequately

understand them. The advice was once given to a clergyman, not to preach on the death of children till he had lost one of his own. So, we cannot preach in a truly heartfelt, sympathizing manner on the truths of redemption, till we have studied them with all our *moral* susceptibilities awake, —till we have both perceived and felt their fitness to our wants. But this presupposes time, personal meditation, earnest prayer; it may be called a lengthened process of spiritual assimilation.

III. The importance of an extended theological course depends in part on the beneficial influence which it exerts on the *mind* of the student. The direct object is not, indeed, the benefit of the intellect. Its great purpose is instruction, the communication of truth, not the intellectual education of the faculties. Still, the latter is a valuable indirect or mediate influence. The three years' course forms somewhat of a circle of subjects, benefiting various faculties of the mind.

The first year is devoted to the study of language. Two prominent effects follow thorough investigations of this kind. One is an exact acquaintance with the import of words, a discriminating appreciation of the value of the terms which pass under the eye, a delicate sense of the difference between words which are commonly regarded as synonymous. A mind thus trained acquires a kind of second-sight, a species of tact, a power of almost intuitive perception, which instinctively detects shades of meaning, nice resemblances, or scarcely perceptible contrasts. This is one of the sources of a correct taste. The scholar thus exercised will avoid ambiguities, unnecessary epithets, prolixity. If there be one word only which will lodge the idea in the hearer's mind, *that* he does not really select; it comes

without bidding. There are many writers who convey their meaning *tolerably* well. On the whole, we are at little loss in understanding them. But they do not produce the deepest impression, because they do not employ the *precise* word which was demanded. They choose one somewhere in the vicinity, — a synonyme, perhaps, — but not *the* term of all others fitted to the place. They have not that *curiosa felicitas* which the Roman writers speak of.

The other effect of the study of languages is the acquisition of a large stock of words. The diligent philologist returns from his investigations richly laden. His studies have made him acquainted with the history of words, with their multiplied branches and ramifications, with the associations which cluster around them. He has consequently laid in a fund for a time of need. For the sake of variety, of deepening an impression, or of vivid illustration, he can clothe his thoughts in the freshest costume, when hackneyed terms, stereotyped phraseology, though perfectly appropriate, would only weary or disgust. The poet Cowper, there is no doubt, owed, in part, his ready command of beautiful and felicitous language to his unwearied study of the great Grecian epic. Sir William Jones, in respect to readiness and variety of address, was perhaps the most accomplished man of his age. This was owing, in a measure, to his extraordinary "gift of tongues."

The beneficial effects of the study of systematic theology are obvious in giving strength, and also logical precision, to the understanding. We cannot master a coherent system of truth, without receiving a twofold benefit. Fresh thoughts, new relations, are perceived, while the instrument itself is perfected. The mind is both instructed and disciplined. Each truth in theology has its appropriate evidence,

something which will more clearly demonstrate *it* than any thing else. Here is required the process of abstraction. We fasten our mind only upon that which is pertinent. We learn to look steadily at the real point in debate, excluding all unrelated ideas ; a habit which is of inestimable importance. Again, each truth is related to the other in a manner befitting its place in the system. It has a link of its own. In ascertaining these appropriate connections, we are forming a logical habit. We are accustoming ourselves to look at truth as a related and indissoluble whole. There is an interdependence among theological truths which is not obvious at first view.

Nothing is more common than to overstate a doctrine, — to present it in the boldest relief, as an independent, isolated fact, — and thus error is virtually taught. To perceive the harmony of Divine truth, how insensibly one color blends with another, in what manner one fact is the basis, or the complement, or the ornament of a related fact, is an interesting branch of theological study. If such study is pursued faithfully, a well-trained intellect will be the result, as certainly as it will be in the study of geometry. *Order* will be the law of the intellect. It will become natural and easy for the mind to look at other subjects in their just relations. It is sometimes said, that there is no system in the Bible; that study of its unconnected parts is all which a clergyman needs. But it is impossible for an intelligent man to read the Scriptures without forming their truths into some kind of system. The nature of the mind renders this system necessary. And the more perfectly we form the system, provided we do no violence to the text, the better we shall understand the truth, and the more perfectly trained will be our intellectual powers.

The study of the history of the Church has two prominent intellectual effects. It strengthens the mind and gives comprehensiveness to the views. No one can study history to much advantage, who does not take some method to classify the multifarious facts; so to arrange them that he can instantly recall them in a time of need; often reviewing them without any aid from the written page. In this manner, one of the most important faculties for him who is to be a public teacher will attain a vigorous growth.

A mere glance at the boundless field of church history will show, that it is eminently fitted to enlarge the views. How has the Bible been understood? What effect has it had on the heart and life in all parts of Christendom? How has it been modified by philosophical systems, by Oriental fancy, by political interference, by Occidental subtlety, by individual temperament? To what forms of church government has it the closest fitnesses? How has it been connected with the progress of civilization and secular learning? The mere propounding of a few questions like these will show the compass of the subject, and the corresponding enlargement which its faithful study will impart.

To the remaining department I do not advert, as it is so mingled in its intellectual effects with all the others. The composition of a sermon demands exegetical skill, clear and logical statement of doctrine, and often an impressive appeal to the experience of the Church.

A study which is followed by such results, it is hardly necessary to say, presupposes an *extended* and *complete* course. Brief and often-intermitted attention to a subject will do very little towards disciplining the mind. On the contrary, its effect may be only to weary and debilitate. The student may become disgusted with philology; he may

feel that divinity is, what its systems are sometimes called, a *corpus*, a *dead* body, and that church history is a confused jumble of heterogeneous facts, — no binding chain running through them. *Patient* and *protracted* study is absolutely necessary, if we wish to have the pursuit sharpen and strengthen our faculties.

IV. The importance of a thorough and protracted course of study depends in a measure on its *moral* effects. These effects are various. I will allude to only one or two of them.

A broken and partial course of intellectual discipline is apt to produce an injurious effect on the moral feelings. These will inevitably partake of the character of the mental processes. If the latter are disorderly or defective, the former will sympathize in the confusion. If the mind does not accustom itself to reflect patiently, the feelings will lose their appropriate, cheerful serenity. If the mind be full of doubts and perturbations, the head will be also. The conscience too, unless obscured and blinded, will utter remonstrances in the face of its delaying and vacillating companion. In order to secure a tranquil state of the emotions, it is indispensable that the scholar should acquire and maintain those intellectual habits, which common sense and conscience alike teach to be his duty.

Again, symmetry in one class of our faculties will tend to produce the same in all the others. The affections, the power of willing, the moral sense, are partly dependent for their growth on intellectual nourishment. They feed upon appropriate truth. They are developed by the rain and sunshine supplied by the study of the Divine works and word. But these must be the subjects of earnest meditation in all their parts, else some one of the dependent moral

affections will be left destitute of its befitting means of growth. It is possible that the study of a doctrinal system may tend to form habits of energy and decision, rather than to promote the growth of the more delicate affections. These will be cherished as the mind is intent on the simple meaning of the Scriptures, or while one is perusing those records that describe the heroic constancy with which the truth has been professed in seasons of imminent peril. The more we study truth as a whole, or, in other words, the more fully we discover it in its original sources, the more closely we examine it in the regular channels in which it was afterwards made to flow, and in the blessed effects which its fertilizing waters have produced, the more perfectly will our entire nature grow up under its healing influences.

V. The necessity of this ample training may be illustrated from certain aspects and tendencies of the present age. Here it will be necessary to discriminate. It is not enough to say, that our country, or the present generation, are distinguished by intense excitability. The past generation, from 1790 to 1815, throughout Christendom, lived in a fever of excitement. Political animosities never raged so fearfully among us, perhaps, as in 1809. The religious world has scarcely ever been more thoroughly aroused, than by the controversies occasioned by the preaching of Whitefield in the last century. It is not enough to say that the present is a superficial age. It is true, and it is not true. Other times have been characterized in certain respects, or among certain classes, by profounder thought, by a more earnest, devotional spirit, by iron habits of study. Still it would be unjust to make the general charge against our contemporaries, that their knowledge is shallow, and their intellectual and moral habits desultory.

In characterizing briefly the present generation, it may be remarked, first, that there is a large class, whose reading is extremely miscellaneous, whose ideas on all subjects are vague, who have no command over their states of mind, who are the victims of the latest excitement. There is a numerous population in the great towns and cities, especially of females, whose tastes are altogether frivolous, who possess the accomplishments without the substance of an education, who are impatient of restraint, the morbid votaries of fashion. This tendency has been created and fostered by a variety of causes: by the sudden influx of wealth, releasing multitudes from personal responsibility; by the immense stores of light reading which have been thrown upon the community; by the rapidity with which news is communicated, as if the whole world, with all its innumerable agitations and excitements, were thrown into one narrow district, as if men had nothing to do but to be the passive recipients of wonder and astonishment, or the subjects of all strange and overwhelming emotions.

But this delineation by no means covers the entire ground. There is, secondly, a very large class of young people of both sexes, especially in the country towns, who are attaining accurate knowledge and thorough mental discipline. The habits which they acquire by the secular studies of the week, are carried into the Sabbath, and strengthened by the friendly collision of the Bible class. The number of intelligent, well-educated young people, in some towns, is so large as to give a coloring and tone to public sentiment. There are many schools at the present day which really educate the mind, which create and cherish a permanent taste for reading and reflection.

But there is, thirdly, a still more numerous class, artisans,

mechanics, workingmen, in great part self-educated, who have sharpened their mental faculties by rough collision in debate, or by the necessities of their vocation, by the competitions of trade, or by the energy of a misguided moral power.

In a part of London, called Spitalfields, there is a population of seventy thousand, chiefly silk-weavers ; they work fourteen hours in a day ; many of them are crowded seven or eight into a room, night and day. There is no public library in the district, and yet as a general fact they are remarkably intelligent, and many of them very acute. It is said that in Birmingham the highest class of poetry, Milton's among others, is read very much by the working people ; that Shakspeare is known by heart almost ; that men can be found who might with credit to themselves be cross-examined on any of his plays ; that there is not a night in that city without a lecture, or public meeting, or concert, or debate, or something of the kind, sometimes three or four in a night. There is a society of young men there formed for the thorough discussion of the principles of political questions. Some of the most intelligent and best-read men in Birmingham are workingmen. Some rise at five o'clock and work for book-money till eight, and then go to their *day's* work. In Manchester there are many operatives who have studied the works of Kant, Fichte, and Hegel. The demand for that class of writings was so great at one time, that the booksellers were not able to furnish them. Some teach themselves German and French, so as to be able to read such works in the original.

Cases analogous to these are doubtless more frequent among the mechanics and manufacturing operatives of our own country. It is in truth a state of society where one

is educated, whether he will be or not. As iron sharpeneth iron, one man, accustomed to reasoning and discussion, will elicit mental sparks from all with whom he comes into frequent contact.

Then, fourthly, a strong tendency of the age is towards physical science. There is some reason to apprehend that it will gradually change the character of our colleges, throw into the background, if it do not displace, literature and spiritual philosophy. The physical sciences are now pursued far more enthusiastically than any other branch of knowledge. They are vitally connected with the acquisition of wealth, and with all the *material* interests of the country. And if pursued exclusively, to the neglect of mental and moral science, they will ultimately lead to scepticism in regard to the testimony of history, sacred and profane. The presence, therefore, of a very large and increasing class of able and accomplished naturalists, may well come into the account of him, who is preparing to be the moral and spiritual teacher of his countrymen.

I will allude to only one more class of men, rapidly increasing at the present time in our country. I mean learned foreigners, men of accomplished education, trained as very few men among us have ever been. It is said, for example, that one of the most distinguished professors of law in Switzerland, a colleague of Professors Agassiz and Guyot, has bought a farm at the West, whither he has removed with a large family. It is thought that our home missionaries, or a considerable number of them, will be compelled to learn the German language, and speak it, so as to gain an influence over the multitudes of immigrants coming from Germany. The number of these immigrants is indeed much less than that coming from Great Britain; but it will con-

stitute a far more important element in our national character. Unhappily, much of the learning, with which many of the Germans are so liberally furnished, may be used in overthrowing the faith which we cherish.

Now it is hardly necessary to say what kind of preachers such a state of society demands. If we allow that the present is a superficial age, that what has been gained in breadth has been lost in depth, it would by no means follow that the public teacher needs to be *less* accomplished. It might require more knowledge of human nature, more versatility of mind and varied acquisition, to influence a captious and impatient audience, than one trained as Dr. Emmons's church was. To silence a backbiting Jew or a sophistical Athenian, might demand greater skill, and a more thorough discipline, than to convince the thoughtful and inquiring Berean. If our countrymen are becoming superficial; if the system of popular lecturing, among other usages, is weakening the intellect while it diffuses information; if the rapidly augmenting influence of our great cities is destroying the love for quiet meditation and profound inquiry, — then the more urgent is the necessity for a race of preachers, who shall throw themselves *athwart* this popular and pernicious tendency; who shall stand up in our metropolitan and village pulpits, and pander to no perverted taste, but effect a lodgment in the conscience and heart by the skill of their aim and the weight of their metal.

The fact that high qualifications are demanded in ministers, whether their sphere of operation be in New England, or in Illinois, or in Aleppo, plainly shows that there can be no misinterpretation of the public feeling. *Wherever* a man goes to preach the Gospel, he ought to do it effectually. In order to accomplish this, he must understand it, its doc-

trines, on what texts they are founded, and the opinions and the usages of those who have professed to believe in them. A missionary in Constantinople lately wrote, that the notes which he took in systematic theology were of inestimable service to him, and he only regretted that they were not more copious. Those who are called to resuscitate the dead churches of the East, require knowledge of the most varied kind, and weapons of the keenest temper.

By these remarks it is not intended to imply, that preachers must be possessed of genius or powerful original talent. This would be manifestly requiring an impossibility. What is meant is, that the talents, whether ten, or two, or five, should be sedulously cultivated. A small edifice may be as systematical as the Parthenon. A little lamp may shed as perfect a light within a certain distance, as one ten times its size. Men of respectable or moderate abilities become most useful servants in the Lord's vineyard, if they worthily improve their talents. Genius is the inheritance of but few. A well-trained intellect and heart may be the patrimony of all.

My remaining object is to point out briefly some of the causes which seriously abridge the prescribed course of study.

1. The first which I would mention is a general restlessness of mind. Some students appear to be unable to sit down quietly and pursue study uninterruptedly three or six months. Their mental discipline appears to most advantage in their skill in framing excuses for absence. The slightest reason, or no reason at all, is sufficient to break up the order of study, or to call them away. In cases where there are reasons of considerable weight, they yield

to them at once, without inquiring: "Is it not a great evil for me to encourage a habit of fickleness in myself and others? May I not lose an important link in the chain of my studies, and thus mar, if I do not seriously injure, my education? May I not better forego the pleasure or advantage of absence, than reduce the amount of my preparation for the greatest work ever committed to man? Allow that it is not necessary for me to be present at a particular exercise, because I have anticipated it, or may easily make it up, will not my absence diminish somewhat the interest of the occasion, or cause a little diminution of that *esprit du corps*, which is as necessary in a class as in an army, and which is not likely to exist where the ranks are not full? If I gain nothing by the lecture myself, I may do good by my presence, and prevent a pernicious personal habit."

This restlessness may be caused by praiseworthy motives. The student may have a sincere, though mistaken, desire to do good to the cause of his Redeemer. He may spend his vacation in labors which promise a rich spiritual harvest. He delays to return to his studies at the appointed time. His class, meanwhile, may have gone over one of the most difficult questions in theology. He has lost what books and subsequent study cannot repair. In a friendly and earnest discussion, some thoughts were thrown out which he could never reach by solitary study; some difficulties were removed which the books do not notice.

If a part of a theological course is of little value, then the whole may be of small account. If a week may be lost without disadvantage, a month may be. Then, why the necessity of theological seminaries at all? Excellent ministers were trained before they were founded. It would

certainly be better to study nine months consecutively with Dr. Emmons or Dr. Bellamy, than to be a member of a theological seminary *ostensibly* three years, and be actually present only at intervals.

Again, this restlessness may follow one into the ministry. If he find it hard to study in a seminary, he will find it harder in a parish. In the one case, he has motives and encouragements which he has not in the other. If he wishes to enjoy a prosperous and happy ministry, he must learn to be a patient thinker. There have been members of this Seminary who were not absent from a single prescribed exercise of any kind for six months. Such have laid one of the best foundations for a life of eminent usefulness, because of patient continuance in well-doing.

2. Another hindrance arises from one's undertaking too much at the outset of his course. In the boundless fields of Biblical, theological, and ecclesiastical learning, there are many tempting by-paths, many fragrant flowers and delicious fruits. I do not refer to miscellaneous knowledge, which has no direct connection with theological subjects; but to certain subordinate branches of theology, or to topics an acquaintance with which would be desirable, but which is not indispensable, or which had better be postponed to a future opportunity. Without being on our guard, we shall be insensibly enticed away from what is essential. Our course will be marked with partial failures, with unaccomplished projects, with half-executed resolves. No one of us, I presume, can look back upon our college course without regret for some ill-advised project, without some sense of shame for having turned aside from the great public path into some alluring by-road. Our aim should have been to master the elements of the successive studies which

came before us, not to spend our strength upon less important, though related topics. Just so in respect to a theological course. We may fritter away our time and faculties, by attempting to do more than we can do well. An individual once made a laborious abstract of a Biblical work in our Seminary library, — a work which he afterwards ascertained was much inferior to several others then in the library. He who has a radical insight into the Latin and Greek languages, may have more intellectual wealth, may be more of a linguist, than the reputed possessor of fifty tongues.

3. Another hindrance to a complete theological education is excessive miscellaneous reading. I would not wholly abjure it, as some nearly do in practice. It is useful in three respects. It is a grateful mental relaxation. It answers the end, in a degree, of exercise. After hard toil, the mind in this way recovers its tone. In the second place, if judiciously conducted, if it be not taken up at haphazard, it will throw no inconsiderable light upon our main pursuit. Many books of secular history are valuable accompaniments to a volume of church history. Thirdly, it is important in its influence upon taste, and upon skill in writing. Those in college who never open a book, except the one prescribed in the course, sometimes fail to interest the audience whom they address. They will appear to advantage in an examination, not on Commencement day. In reading approved miscellaneous authors, we are insensibly refining our taste, and adding to the stock of our ideas, and we are thus *directly* promoting our great object, — acquiring ability to guide the opinions of others.

But the hazard is great. An interesting book beguiles not only the unstable, but those who fully intend to guard

against the seduction. It is much more pleasant to read than it is to investigate; to revel in the pages of the historian or fictitious writer, than to reflect on a difficult point in morals or theology. The one falls in with our native indolence, or curiosity, or love of excitement; the other demands self-denial and immediate compliance with duty. I recollect an individual who would sometimes spend half the night in reading an attractive volume which he found in his neighbor's room; of course he was not present at the next morning prayers, perhaps not at the lecture. It should be remembered, that the greatest advantages of miscellaneous reading are not secured, unless a firm basis is laid in hard study. Whatever else is neglected, the assigned lesson should not be. The best hours of the day, those in which the mind is most awake, should be employed on the main study in hand. This accomplished, we shall resort with a delightful satisfaction, felt in no other circumstances, to the history, the poem, or the newspaper.

Dr. Emmons was accustomed to say, that "he read only the best and the worst books"; i. e. the ablest for and against his opinion.

John Foster says: "Few have been sufficiently sensible of the importance of that economy in reading, which selects, *almost exclusively*, the very *first order* of books. Why should a man, except for some very special reason, read a very inferior book, at the very time that he might be reading one of the highest order." Perhaps few admonitions, for most of us, could be more important than this.

4. In the last place, a theological course is often somewhat abridged by the irresolution and languor which are apt to be felt during the last weeks of a term. This, perhaps, cannot be wholly prevented. The change from the

bracing air of winter to the warmer atmosphere of spring is in a measure debilitating. The powers of the body necessarily undergo some modification.

But as it occasions a serious loss in study, and as it should seem that three months of vacation afford adequate time for mental recreation, it is worthy of serious inquiry, whether the evil cannot be greatly mitigated, if it is not wholly removed. May not a system of bodily exercise be so wisely planned and so conscientiously pursued, as to enable one to retain a good measure of strength to the close of each term? Should not that degree of moderation be practised in the studies of the early and middle portions of the session, which will leave the powers substantially unimpaired to the end? Is it not worthy of some consideration, how we may make the most of the precious time which God has given us? If, by prudence and forethought, you can save a week or a month, when topics of such interest are pressing on your attention, should not the effort be made? You are about to become the public teachers of your fellowmen; to set yourselves up, virtually, as models of whatever is fair, good, and worthy to be copied. Strict conscientiousness lies at the foundation of the ministerial character. He only who faithfully employs his time, and the other talents which God has given him, can speak with authority to others, concerning their duties and their dangers.

CHRISTIANS SHOULD STUDY THE PROFOUNDER MYSTERIES OF THEIR FAITH.

It is the uniform representation of the Bible, that men are sanctified through the truth, are morally transformed by the Gospel of Christ, or that their spiritual education is accomplished by means of the Christian doctrines.

It becomes, therefore, a momentous question, What is the relation between the truth and the human mind and heart? What is the nature and the degree of the communication between them? How far are they in contact? If there be any living sympathy between them, how can the number of vital points be augmented? Where is the process of assimilation *active?* Where has it become deficient or ceased altogether? It is evident, on a moment's reflection, that the degrees of this transforming process may be almost infinitely various.

In the first place, we may conceive of an individual who has no knowledge whatever of any *positive* revelation, whose mind is in very great doubt and perplexity on all spiritual subjects, to whom the future is nearly an entire blank; but through the darkness of whose understanding there has, once in a while, shot a ray of light, which has come one knows not whence; a little fragment of traditional truth

has floated to him down those gloomy waters which lie back of him. His mind has become uneasy, his conscience has uttered its faint murmur, a feeble sense of sin and ill-desert has been awakened. He has moments of secret yearning for some better light, some clew that will lead him out of the labyrinth. His mind, dark, confused, almost inextricably perplexed, *is* in contact with the truth. The spirit of God, in some unknown method, has touched a chord which now tremblingly vibrates. He has, in a small degree, a preparation of heart for some further discovery. He anticipates the truth, rather than possesses it. He is not *in* the temple, but he has placed his foot on the lowest step of the portico. The darkness has not passed away, but yet it is not increasing. When a purer light shall fall upon his benighted spirit, it may be found that there was some aptitude or readiness to admit it.

We may suppose, in the second place, another individual, who never enjoyed any direct revelation, to whom God never spoke by articulate voice, or in dreams or visions of the night; but by some visible symbol, through some outward rite, in some significant action, there was prefigured to him some great redeeming truth. Through these thick veils he dimly saw and really felt the power of an undeveloped, spiritual principle. A little edge of the curtain which concealed from him the far distant future, was for a moment raised, and faith sprung up in his soul, and took the place of vision.

There is another large class, in the third place, who look at truth through a discolored medium. The doctrine exerts little of its transforming power, because it cannot pierce the cloud of prejudices by which it is met. It is only occasionally, and at great disadvantage, that it touches the mind

which it is fitted to regenerate. Innumerable foreign objects are interposed between it and the soul. If there be any spiritual life in that soul, its pulsations are feeble and intermittent. If any true conceptions of the Gospel are entertained, they can exert but little practical power, distorted as they are by prepossessions and countless errors.

I would allude, in the fourth place, to a large class who live in Christian lands, where the Gospel is enjoyed in its simplicity and purity, but who receive, for the most part, only a small degree, if it may be so expressed, of saving power, or only an indirect benefit. They are believers by education, or on traditionary evidence. The Gospel does not ordinarily come to them with power, as demanding their individual faith and acceptance. They have *received* it, rather than *believed* in it. They have taken it upon trust, or as a bequest, rather than searched into its meaning or imbibed its spirit by a personal and self-appropriating examination. The Gospel is to them an outward and adventitious support, not a life-giving power, not the theme of earnest meditation, and not even the occasion of doubt or perplexity; but it is regarded as a legacy, into the possession of which they have come without any thought or care of their own, and whose indirect and earthly blessings may be enjoyed as a matter of course.

I may name others, in the fifth place, who are interested in the Gospel *intellectually*, who make it a matter of distinct and earnest investigation, who digest its truths, who obtain clear and discriminating views of its doctrines, who are strenuous and able in the defence of its evidences, and who have obtained the mastery of it, considered as a system of abstract knowledge. But, unhappily, they have not at the same time brought it near to their undying spirit, to their moral nature,

as a medicine of wondrous efficacy. They have dissociated it from that for which it was specially designed. It does not elevate the earthward affections, it does not rectify the perverse tendencies, it does not exorcise the soul of its powers of evil, because it is jealously excluded from this region and made merely the sign of intellectual ideas, or a grateful exercise for the reasoning powers.

I would allude, in the sixth place, to a very large class of Christians, who unite to a certain extent a correct knowledge of the Christian system with a partial obedience to its precepts. They understand at least the first principles of the Gospel, and endeavor not to neglect the duties growing out of their knowledge. Their acquaintance with the Gospel is not merely traditional, or the result of education. Their observance of the requisitions of the Gospel is something more than obedience to the law of custom, or an imitation of the example of others. But, unhappily, little growth is perceptible either in their knowledge or their virtues. In both respects they are contented to remain for ever children, never able to go beyond their elementary lessons, never to be disengaged from the hand of their teacher. The Gospel is not a *life* within them, a germinating principle that insures a growth and a vigorous maturity. They are satisfied with a small amount of knowledge and of religious experience. This tardy progress, this almost stationary position, is not owing to the lack of opportunities, to any deficiency in natural power, to any unavoidable hindrances in the providence of God. A great proportion of the members of the Christian Church in our country are, doubtless, in this state of comparative infancy, without any sufficient cause. They are not in that condition of extreme poverty which debars them from attending

earnestly and continuously to religious truth. There is such a general competence, so much undisturbed tranquillity, such a sense of security and peace, as to favor and encourage the largest attainments in knowledge and grace, such as the world has rarely, perhaps never, seen. There is likewise a stimulated curiosity on all other subjects, a shrewd and awakened intellect, a remarkable aptness in discovering and investigating truth in all departments of knowledge. But on one subject, and that the most momentous, a theme where knowledge is eternal life, where experience enlarges and ennobles the soul, the mind is satisfied with contracted views, with the mere elements of truth, with an imperceptible progress, with a feeble and hesitating faith.

Now, in opposition to all these inadequate, partial, unproductive methods of considering truth, in marked contrast with all this indolent, fitful, uninfluential reception of the Gospel, we are urged by the New Testament, not only to a practical use of it, but also to a study which shall be earnest, systematic, steadily advancing till one height after another is gained, till, by the influence of divine truth, the soul is gradually freed from its thraldom and stands erect in its conscious liberty and enlarging knowledge.

It is now time, says the Apostle, in Hebrews vi. 1, 2, to leave your elementary lessons, to throw off the badges of pupilage, no longer to occupy yourselves in laying the foundations. In busying yourselves with these introductory lessons, you give a *false* impression of the *nature* of Christianity, as though it were made up of a few rudimental elements, and did not possess a thousand fruitful and inexhaustible principles, and were not a system of perfect truth fitted for the soul in its most enlarged capacity and in its widest investigations. You long ago professed to compre-

hend and receive the doctrine of repentance ; it is the very first step in the Christian life ; it is the food of infancy ; it is a truth of exceeding simplicity ; it is taught by the light of nature ; its obligation is testified to by every one's consciousness. *Faith*, too, is no recondite or hard doctrine ; it is a lesson which children may learn ; it was the great theme of our teaching when we laid the foundation of the Christian churches ; its reasonableness is so plain, its claims are so obvious, that it does not require *long* study or laborious investigation to set them forth. Baptism is the *initiatory* rite ; its significance was long ago recognized by you as Jews, its symbolical value and pertinence are acknowledged by you readily, for it is a species of instruction with which you have been long familiar. So likewise of the laying on of hands. You have witnessed, in a thousand cases, that it is the sign of the communication of the Holy Spirit. It is not a topic on which you need to dwell. The fact is simple, the lesson obvious to the meanest capacity. And there is no special difficulty which should make you linger speculatively on the truth of the general resurrection or of eternal judgment. As practical men, you must be very familiar with the *power* of God. Its wonderful effects in the world meet your eyes unceasingly. The resurrection of nature in the spring, the germination of a plant, would no more take place, separate from the power of God, than the resuscitation of the human body. If you believe in God's power in one case, you cannot disbelieve it in the other. And in regard to a judgment to come, the whole creation groaneth for it even now. Your own moral nature cries aloud for it in all its depths. It is written on the pages of your Old Testament Scriptures, and every thoughtful heathen moralist has reinforced it.

All these truths are important, but they are *elementary ;*

they do not pertain to the superstructure ; they are not the subjects specially concerned with your progression in Christian knowledge. Continually reverting to them, you will never come into the glorious freedom of perfect men in Christ. Your life will be sickly, your knowledge scanty, your final reward small.

There are other themes profounder, more comprehensive, more practical, which solicit and command your attention. What should *now* awaken your most earnest study is Christianity considered as the fulfilment of a long series of predictions, the great centre to which a thousand converging influences have tended since the creation of the world, the key which unlocks treasures of wisdom richer than all the gems of the East ; — Christianity, considered as universal in its nature, as breaking down the impassable wall between you and all other nations, as the great umpire in all strifes, uniting the entire race of Adam in a universal brotherhood, as furnishing the guaranty of friendship, the principle of unity, the solvent of prejudices, long desired, but found in no other system.

Preëminently are you to study Christianity and feel its ennobling effects in the life and character of its Founder ; — a theme wonderful as his nature, exhaustless as his love, the love of him who was subordinate to the Father, and yet worshipped by angels ; a subject of God's government, and yet laying the corner-stone of the universe ; compassed about with infirmities, and yet sustaining all things by the word of his power ; made like the feeblest of his brethren, and yet the counterpart and image of uncreated glory. Here are mysteries, or what may be termed classes of mysteries, systems of wonders. Here is Christianity seen in its noblest forms. Here is study which ages cannot exhaust, whose

interest neither time nor eternity can diminish. Stimulating and productive in the highest degree for the intellect, it is at the same time practical as no other study can be, lays low all opposing passions, exalts the soul in adoration, and breathes into the man what he never felt before, the loving and ennobling spirit of the Saviour himself.

A similar course of argument is exhibited in the First Epistle to the Corinthians. The Apostle there maintains, first, that the Spirit of God alone knows all things, for he searches the deep things of God, in the same manner as the spirit of a man searches what is in man; secondly, that the Apostles have received this Spirit, and consequently know in a measure what is in God; and thirdly, that it is the duty and privilege of all Christians to participate in this knowledge. Eye hath not seen, ear hath not heard, the heart of man hath not conceived, what is now or may be now revealed unto us in relation to the counsels of God, or the mysteries of redeeming grace. What are the *deep* things of God? Doubtless among them are his eternal decrees, the gradual and wondrous unfolding of his purposes, the mystery of the incarnation, the profound laws of God's providence, the astonishing methods by which good is educed from evil, the divine fitnesses of the Gospel to the ten thousand complicated wants of man's intellectual and moral nature. These are the themes which demand and will amply repay the most earnest and long-continued meditation. In this discipline, ever progressive, never ending, so strengthening to the soul, the Apostle strenuously exhorted his disciples to *exercise* themselves.

The topic thus suggested, I wish briefly to illustrate, — the obligation of Christians to study the profounder mysteries of their faith. What are some of the reasons for *leaving*

the elementary principles, and for dwelling on truths of deeper import and larger application?

Now we ought not to say, as some do, that such a course would conduct us to unprofitable speculation; that it might lead us to the brink of some fearful precipice, to the consideration of questions into which the angels would fear to intrude; that the truths of the Gospel are simple, practical, apprehensible by children; that we have no need to traverse the depths of metaphysical theology, or to cast our short line into the fathomless abysses of abstract truth; the word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth and thy heart; nourishing food is spread immediately before thee in the amplest profusion.

But in this method of excusing ourselves from earnest meditation, or from toiling up the heights of Christian knowledge, two things seem to be forgotten; first, that there is in most Christians the greatest danger of sloth, of resting satisfied with the smallest amount of knowledge that will save the soul, of ever learning and never being able to come to the knowledge of the truth. In the churches of New England, with all their intelligence, it may be safely said, that, where *one* presumptuously speculates on the Christian doctrines, one hundred rest torpidly, through life, on the mere preliminary lessons in the outer court. Secondly, it is forgotten that the great mysteries of the Christian system may be studied with all childlike docility, with all reverential wonder, with the severest self-scrutiny, lest the practical applications should not be perceived and felt. The fact, that Sir Isaac Newton penetrated farther than any one before him into the mysteries of these material heavens, does not prove, assuredly, that he lost his simplicity of character, and became vain of his vast attainments. The fact, that Augustine and Calvin cast a more penetrating eye than others had

done, into the abysses of the *spiritual* heavens, into the nature of man and the nature of God, does not necessarily convict them of presumption or of pride. It is possible that their researches into the remotest provinces of human inquiry, had exactly the contrary effect, — that humility walked hand in hand with science.

The first reason which I would suggest for progress in religious knowledge, for the study of the higher doctrines of Christianity, is this: in no other way can the practical benefits of the Gospel be enjoyed to any great extent by those who have the means of obtaining this knowledge. Those who are familiar with the elementary truths of religion, whose minds are enlightened and active on other subjects, cannot expect *that* nutriment from the simpler truths of the Gospel, which they might have once enjoyed, and of which children in the Christian life may be now participating.

The reasons for this are perfectly obvious. In the first place, God does not impart his spiritual gifts, without the coöperating agency of the recipient; or rather, effort, on the part of man, will alone insure that state of mind which can enjoy the gift. This is the universal law of his providence. Light is communicated in proportion to the degree it which it can be felt, participated in. A large amount of consolation, of Christian comfort, cannot be expected by those who have the capacity to make large attainments in Christian knowledge, but *fail* to do so. There is an admirable fitness or measure between what is communicated and what an individual has actually labored to comprehend or prepare himself for. A contrary procedure would subvert all our natural ideas, as well as all that we know of the Divine dispensations. Those simple truths which might be over-

flowing with consolation to one in a state of illness or sorrow, with weakened powers of mind and body, may lose their chief attractiveness to the same individual when he is able to meditate on profounder truths.

In the second place, there is a natural fitness or proportion between the mental development and the themes on which the mind employs itself. Though all the topics in theology, the simpler as well as the profounder, are fitted in certain aspects to tax the highest powers of man, and may contain mysteries which he cannot solve, yet there is still a more perfect correspondence between a highly disciplined intellect and the profounder doctrines of our faith, than there is between such an intellect and the simpler elements of religion. A child may comprehend the most important facts in regard to the doctrine and duty of repentance. A child cannot understand the analogies of religion to the constitution and course of nature.

In the third place, there is the frown of conscience in the one case, its approving smile in the other. If a Christian, with ample opportunities, with strong and cultivated powers of mind, neglects to make progress in Christian knowledge, does not try to comprehend, with all saints, the height and length and breadth of the scheme of Christianity, and if he endeavors to extract consolation and support from the simple truths which are appropriate to a novice in the Christian life, then he may expect the disapproving voice of conscience, loud in proportion to its susceptibility and his neglect. If he is precluded, in the providence of God, from making this advance, there is no inward reproach. If there be a strange disparity between the intellectual and spiritual topics on which he employs his mind, the moral sense cannot fail to disturb his peace.

The second reason which I would suggest for this earnest attention to the higher doctrines of Christianity, for a systematic and steady advance in knowledge and grace, is derived from the nature of the human soul.

We are so made as to take pleasure in what is simple, easy, obvious at the first sight, having nothing which is subtile, complicated, or mutually dependent. We love what is natural, inartificial, that which we can apprehend at once, which appeals to our every-day and most common feelings and thoughts. We are also fitted to love what is linked together as a system, what cannot be understood at a glance, what has a perfect coherence in all its parts, what has depth, height, symmetry, complexity, what requires earnest, prolonged, and profound attention.

The Bible is the most simple and unostentatious book in the world, written in a style of most admirable and winning simplicity, as though the authors never had a thought that they were recording any difficult or mysterious doctrines. It often sounds like a disconnected journal, or memoranda put down at leisure and in those scraps of time saved from weightier engagements, or it appears in the form of letters, most inartificial and confidential. Well for the world that it is so. Its exceeding simplicity is one of its divinest signatures. Nowhere does its Author's gracious benignity appear more conspicuous. This fits it for the feeble, for the infirm, for millions of heathen just emerging from midnight darkness. Children may wander over its sacred fields, and drink at its refreshing fountains, and never be weary as they pick up its delicious fruits.

But, *with* all this artless and inimitable simplicity, *along* with all this prescient adaptation and shaping to the circumstances of man, feeble, poor, ignorant, the Bible may be

affirmed to be, in one sense, the most *systematic* of all books, the most coherent, the most susceptible of being viewed as a *perfect* whole, the least obnoxious to the charge of being superficial, illogical, unconnected. Its great doctrines may be arranged, not merely into one systematic form, but into many forms; they may be viewed in a great variety of connected relations. So a single doctrine may contain a system in itself. It may have coherent and beautifully harmonizing proofs, as well as systems of practical instruction. It is so with the precepts of the Christian religion. They may be wrought into a beautiful system, shedding mutual grace on each other, revealing common affinities before unknown, fitnesses to all our moral relations and wants, and to all our moral susceptibilities. Precisely analogous is the composition of many of the single portions of the Scriptures. The book of Job has many detached passages of the most impressive character, lingering for ever in one's memory and appealing to the deepest sensibilities of our nature. But the most striking characteristic of that poem, possibly, is the fine network, the delicate bands, invisible often to the cursory reader, which connect it from beginning to end, which make all its parts fit together, and which produce a final and complete impression, beyond human art and worthy of its Divine Author.

If such, therefore, be the constitution of the human soul, loving order, delighting in system, ever tracing effects to their causes, ever searching after the ultimate grounds of an opinion or doctrine, ever combining truth, in all its departments, into an orderly series, and into comely proportions, and if the Scriptures also involve and presuppose a similar arrangement of their sublime doctrines and practical morals, then we are furnished with a cogent argument in

favor of constant progress in Christian knowledge, of patient and strenuous efforts in searching into the deep things of God, and in comprehending some of those truths which seem now incomprehensible, mainly because of our indifference and inattention. The very framework of our moral and intellectual nature is a strong antecedent presumption, that such is our duty and our privilege.

The third reason which I may be permitted to adduce, is the additional light which this progressive and profound study of the higher doctrines would cast on the simpler and elementary truths. We cannot understand or appreciate all the interesting relations of these first lessons, without the reflection of those luminous bodies which lie beyond. The light of the celestial city, as the pilgrim drew near it, shot its rays athwart the river of death, and illuminated the mountains and valleys, which would have been otherwise shrouded in darkness. So of a great Christian doctrine. It makes all the antecedent and preparatory truths luminous. It sends back its lines of light far and near into the regions of natural religion. Comprehending that, we comprehend these. Difficulties here find an adequate solution there. In studying the profounder, though related truths, we unexpectedly meet with thoughts and illustrations which clothe the simpler topic with a fresh interest. The profounder and more distant truths supply the urgent motives to understand those which are preliminary, and to perform the duties growing out of them. What an impressive call to repentance may be drawn from the eternal decrees of God, from his electing love, revealing purposes of grace springing out of the remotest abysses of a past eternity! How it reinforces the obligation to believe in the Son of God, as we study those few but

fruitful words which declare his preëxistent dignity, and the nature of his union with the Eternal Father! What an impressive commentary on the importance of fraternal love and a comprehensive charity among all Christ's servants, one may enjoy as he studies deeply into the nature of Christianity, which knows no other motive but God's honor, breathes no other spirit than universal love! Indeed, all the first principles and elementary truths of religion are seen in their truest and fairest proportions, and in their most practical bearings also, only in the reflected and discriminating light which comes from the greater and more distant luminaries.

In the fourth place, this diligent study of the higher doctrines presupposes that we shall reach a commanding position from which to view all truth. We stand on a lofty eminence. The exact boundaries of several adjacent kingdoms are visible. The great sea lies tranquil in the distance. The rivers, lined by threads of living green, flow along, each in its own order, and in that graceful meandering in which no two streams are alike. The harvests in all stages of their growth, in all their variegated colors, yet with perfect distinctness of form, rejoice under the smile of their Creator. Man's works, too, just before seeming so vast, or lifting themselves high up in the heavens, as if more cunning artificers than men had laid their corner-stones, now assume their true and hardly discernible proportions. So when we arrive at one of the lofty and central truths of the Christian system, there at once appear admirable proportions, consummate skill in arrangement, or rather the entire absence of art, as if all the parts *grew* by an inward power; no deformity, no disturbance, no incongruity;

a fitness and grace so wondrous, that the fairest of earth's landscapes can afford only a faint type and an inadequate symbol.

The doctrines of Christianity are not all of the same significance and value, even those which we term fundamental. One truth differeth from another in glory. One has for us more practical instruction than another. Some lie nearer the centre than others. Some rest on the written word alone ; others are presupposed and anticipated in the earlier revelations. *This* doctrine is attended with greater difficulties than *that*. The nearer, therefore, we approach to the centre of the system, the more commanding the position we attain, the closer we stand to the cross of Jesus, — thicker clustering around us will be the proofs of Divine wisdom, the more rapidly will difficulties disappear, the more will all the parts become adjusted and in harmony, the more luminous and enlivening will be the beams that shall fall upon us. In these heavenly places, the great Apostle seems almost uniformly to have stood, his mind crowded with thoughts, his heart overflowing with admiration, as he tried to make his readers comprehend with him something of the riches of the glory of the mysteries which were unfolding before him.

This leads me to remark, in the fifth place, that, advancing in the knowledge of God, through his grace attaining one elevated point after another, we shall not only discover truth in its masses, in its outlines and larger forms, but the more capable shall we be to see it in its nicer shades, in those delicate lineaments which shrink from the vulgar gaze, those refined and almost invisible harmonies which connect what we sometimes imagine to be the isolated facts of re-

demption. Studying profoundly, and with that true humility and that unceasing practical aim which can alone insure success, our moral vision will become pure and far-sighted, and our moral sensibilities will become so chastened and delicate, that we may be able to see in the works of God, and in the system of redemption, the little filaments as it were, the most attenuated threads, those lines of exquisite slenderness and grace, which are the most convincing proofs of the skill of Him, who clothes all nature and all truth with ten thousand nameless beauties, and interweaves within them ten thousand harmonies and fitnesses. Thus a part of our present reward, in studying the scheme of redemption, is not merely the sight of truth in its grander forms and in its united and imposing effects, but in its minute subdivisions, in its numberless small ramifications and delicate shadings, which, like the colors of the rainbow, seem to run into each other, but which are really separable and distinct. We can comprehend even now small portions at least of the great scheme of redemption, but we are destitute, for the most part, of those finer feelings, those delicate spiritual apprehensions, which we suppose the angels in light possess. Too often we resemble a company of children, running over a field, in which are scattered pieces of gold and precious stones. We see and carry off the larger and apparently the richer fragments, but our steps are too hurried and our vision is too dull, to permit us to see the little, half-concealed gems that are of untold value.

In the last place, it should seem that a common feeling of gratitude would lead us to leave the principles of the Gospel of Christ, the suburbs of the city of God, and penetrate to the nobler views that shall greet our vision within.

It is a great privilege to ascend some of earth's mountain-tops, and gaze on the outspread bosom of the earth, till the finite seems to be almost lost in the infinite. For these faint reflections from God's face, one cannot be too grateful.

It is a high privilege to look through the astronomer's glass. One would think that the heart would overflow with emotion, and words of gratitude would constantly tremble on the lips, as one leaf after another of that sublime theology is unrolled before us.

Greater still, if possible, is the privilege of gazing at the other extreme of God's works; of beholding, through the medium of science, the wonders on wonders, which a small worm, a dry leaf, a little flintstone, a minute coral of the ocean, reveal. How can one hesitate, living in such mysteries, to bow down in grateful praise and lowly adoration! But what are all these in comparison with the truths of redemption, with the grace of the Redeemer, the love of the Holy Spirit, the mystery of godliness, the themes in which we have the angels for fellow-students, our Lord as the omniscient instructor, our own endless well-being as both the immediate and the ultimate aim! Common thankfulness, it should seem, would lead us never to tire in plucking these medicinal leaves, these immortal fruits, which grow for our especial benefit. By remembering what God has done for us, we should be impelled to make the utmost practical use of all those regenerating truths which lie within our possible grasp. Or rather, we should need no external inducement, no pressing invitation, no suggestion of conscience or of gratitude. We could not stay away from this royal table. We should throng around these wells of living water. So ennobling is Divine truth, so healing to the

broken spirit, so precisely does it meet the craving wants of a corrupt nature, so fully does it respond to the yearnings of the immortal spirit, so efficacious is it in all the exigencies of our being, in life and in death, that we should feel a kind of insatiable covetousness till we have sounded its depths, and climbed its heights, and made trial of its last possible powers of help and restoration, and given to our Redeemer that tribute of love, of honor, of thankfulness, as great and as trustful as the limits of a finite capacity will permit.

COLLATERAL SIGNS OF HUMAN DEPRAVITY.

A PROFOUND and practical belief of the *depravity* of man, the depravity of man as such, is of the greatest importance in several respects. Without it, we are liable to judge of human character and of all moral subjects very superficially. We look only on the *surface* of things, not penetrating to the depths of the soul, where virtue and vice have their origin, where alone the color and complexion of motives can be ascertained. Without this belief, we are not in a position to estimate any moral subject aright, but shall certainly form erroneous or inadequate views. Our own personal character, too, will be laid on an insufficient basis. A thorough conviction of the sins and imperfections which characterize man, all men, ourselves as individuals, forms the only true foundation of character. Genuine humility, or what the Scriptures denominate brokenness of heart, is an *indispensable* element in human character. If we cherish only faint impressions of our sinfulness, the Gospel of Christ will be an insolvable riddle, will be robbed of its chief worth and significance. It is a remedial system, an extraordinary provision of grace, only to those who are convinced of their personal and urgent necessities. It is not

singular, that the condition of the heathen awakens but little interest among all those classes of religionists who deny or doubt the melancholy truth of man's lost estate. It is only by a deep and all-pervading conviction of the churches, that the pagan *is* actually *in* this moral ruin, that adequate and immediate relief will be supplied. If he possess *germs* of goodness which will be likely to thrive under the dews and light of the religion of nature, then it is not difficult to justify our tardiness or reluctance in sending to him the Gospel. "They that are whole need not a physician."

But important as this deep-seated conviction is, it is not easy of attainment. No task is harder than to obtain a practical and influential belief in a truth which is so vital, but still so humiliating. The impediments are numerous; the counter-influences are insidious and ever operating.

First, there is the pride of personal opinion, which is hard to be overcome; the inherent and overweening selfishness, the proud or the vain self-conceit, which may admit that there is depravity in general, but which will perseveringly deny it in particular, which is ready to confess to weaknesses if they are not made too specific, and if they are not represented as flowing from a hidden fountain of corruption.

Secondly, there is the reluctance to judge harshly of others. It seems to be repugnant to the laws of courtesy and of Christian charity, to think or to speak of our neighbors and friends as the subjects, one and all, of a deep-seated, radical moral disorder. It may shock our ideas of propriety and of what is due in social intercourse, to apply to all men indiscriminately those elements of moral character, which seem to belong only to the most abandoned of the race.

Then, thirdly, we may find it difficult to distinguish between the different exercises or states of our minds. We find it hard, for example, to discriminate between the dictates of reason and the impulses of a depraved heart. When we listen to the voice of reason, mark its pure light, take cognizance of its ennobling conceptions, and consider its possible growth and culture, we can hardly bring ourselves to the belief that such a faculty can dwell in the midst of moral impurity, can be subjected to the law of sin and death; or we *confound* its operations with the darker movements of the heart. Because *one* seems to be heavenward in its tendency, we fondly imagine the other to be so likewise.

Then, fourthly, there is the same obstacle resulting from the want of discrimination between the dictate of the moral sense and of the heart. We know and approve what is good, and are tempted to think that in this knowledge and approbation there is the feeling of complacency, the emotion of true virtue. We do not yield an implicit obedience to the commands of this moral sense; yet, because its voice is not entirely hushed, nor its authority over the soul utterly set at naught, we may imagine that the heart beats responsive, and that we are gradually gaining the mastery over the evil that is within us. We fail to distinguish between the voice of conscience and those feelings which give the tone and coloring to our character as it is in the sight of God.

Allied to this, there are certain aspirations of the soul towards God, constitutional it may be, the product partly of imagination, partly of a reflective turn of mind. There are brief moments when the downward motion of the soul seems to be suspended; when the depraved tendencies are

in a kind of abeyance; when there is a gleam of light from that brightness which originally surrounded the soul; when there are certain mysterious sounds from that cunning harp whose strings are not quite all broken. This momentary experience may be mistaken for true virtue. These occasional and almost unaccountable states of mind may seem to be proof positive, that the soul is actually gaining the mastery over its powers of evil.

There is also the feeling of natural gratitude, a joyousness of the heart when prosperity attends us, a spontaneous going forth of the affections towards God as the benefactor of his creatures, which is not the perennial, spiritual, practical feeling required by the Gospel, but which may be readily confounded with it.

There are also natures which are constitutionally generous, high-minded, endued with the nicest perceptions of what is true and honorable; shrinking, like the sensitive plant, from aught which is corrupt and mean; persons endued with singular delicacy and purity of feeling, to whom it were a bitter thing to inflict on another the slightest pain.

There is, besides, the large class whose social sympathies are quick, who in all the common relations of life are kindly, overflowing with good-will towards all around them, or who have made the culture of a symmetrical and beautiful domestic character the object of special attention, and who would really be the ornaments and bright examples of any community.

Now these and many other classes of feeling, these and many other descriptions of character, so common in a highly civilized and Christian community, render it difficult to convince ourselves and others, that there may be in connection a radical and alarming depravity; that the moral fountain

still sends out its bitter waters; that beneath this fascinating exterior there is not one throb of truly virtuous emotion; that the heart is cold, utterly indifferent, towards the Creator and Redeemer; that there is no complacency in those spiritual objects which *should be* the continual feast of man's immortal spirit. In short, we are misled; we do not discriminate between true virtue, the characteristics of Scriptural holiness, and certain qualities or elements which may coexist with, or which may form the staple of, a character that is predominantly selfish.

At the same time, if we fail to become thoroughly convinced that *man*, *all* men, are involved in a common and melancholy apostasy, that both Jews and Gentiles, the high and the low, the learned and the ignorant, are lying under the condemnation of the law, it is not for want of sufficient evidence. The truth is supported by the amplest proof. Nature and revelation, man's voice and God's, the sinless yet suffering animal creation, the records of the past, the forebodings of the future, the sad consciousness of the present, one and all give in their mournful verdict.

The proofs of man's depravity are numerous, direct, and unequivocal.

There are the positive assertions of the Scriptures, declarations which comprehend the race without exception, which admit of no doubt or limitation, which declare that Jews and Gentiles are *all* under sin. These two classes exhaust mankind.

Then there are the implications of the Bible. Many of the exhortations and precepts of the New Testament involve the truth of this doctrine, and are unintelligible without it. This virtual, incidental, indirect proof is often the most convincing.

Christianity itself is an argument for the same doctrine. Without this truth Christianity would be superfluous, an amazing expenditure of means and resources with no adequate object. The cost of the provision presupposes the depth of the necessity. The comprehensive nature of the remedy proceeds on the ground of the universality of the disease. If man is not lost, then Christ died in vain.

Another argument is the testimony of history, of all history, of the history of every nation. It is unnecessary to say that the public annals of the most enlightened, the most highly civilized, even the most Christian nation that has ever existed, or does now exist, cannot be read by any thoughtful man without tears, without a sinking of the heart, without a sense of shame, without indignation. If there is an occasional calm on this restless sea, it is deceptive; it forebodes a fiercer tempest. If mankind have not been overtaken with a terrible moral disaster, why has there not been, in the long lapse of ages, some tribe or nation which has constituted an exception, one luminous spot in the gloomy sky, one illustrious example of the humanizing and ennobling influence of learning, culture, civilization, and of the better feelings of our nature?

Should we leave the page of *general* history, and examine the traditions, the unwritten records of small communities, neighborhoods, families, would the case be essentially different? Is it not bliss here to be ignorant? Passions which elsewhere convulse the world, here run their *little* round, unobserved, it may be, by the stranger, but corroding and wasting whatever they touch.

Again, there is an argument drawn from the personal experience of the most reflecting, thoughtful, self-scrutinizing individuals; — an experience, painful and most humiliating,

forced upon them in every hour of candid reflection. How to perform that which is good, they find not; the will, the boasted iron will, is not to be depended on. The reason and the conscience ever point and struggle upward, but there is a stronger power, treacherous and malignant, ever on the alert.

But without dilating on these arguments, let us briefly consider a class of facts, which possibly may not be regarded as proofs so much as *corroborating* circumstances, which render the doctrine of human sinfulness to a greater or less extent probable, which cannot well be explained without admitting its truth. Some of the considerations to which I refer, may indeed be regarded as *virtual* proofs; others, as auxiliary circumstances. All may have weight with those persons who distrust, or who are not convinced by the common and obvious arguments.

The first fact which I shall mention is, the unwillingness to be satisfied with the truth of Christianity, after it is established on a solid foundation; a strange hesitation to admit the evidence which is so abundantly presented; a constant demand for additional light; a determination not to be practically convinced, till every difficulty is obviated, till every apparent discrepancy is reconciled. Now this is not the method which we take in regard to any other subject. In all the affairs of common life, in all matters depending on human testimony, in all which concerns man's complicated relations on earth, we are accustomed quietly to rest on well-established evidence, though it be not absolutely perfect, though there may be a lower degree of *countervailing* testimony, though there may be subordinate circumstances for which it is difficult to account. In all such cases we feel no misgiving. We proceed at once to the discharge of the duties growing out of our belief. Scepti-

cism would be a mark of folly or insanity. But in respect to the Gospel men adopt an altogether different procedure. There it stands, supported by a weight of evidence to which no other ancient record can lay the least claim; canvassed, sifted, confronted, cross-examined, as no other book ever has been; all its statements of facts, contemporary allusions, incidental notions, as well as its cardinal truths and doctrines, subjected to the keenest inspection, and suspected or denounced if one and all of them do not come unharmed from this seven times heated furnace. Other subjects we put at rest. In other matters demanding our assent and our practical faith, we acquiesce. We *rest* upon them as established truths. But the Gospel, men are not willing to take out of the arena of strife, and live upon it, and be nourished by it as a faithful saying, worthy of all acceptation. A distinguished scholar once said, that he would not believe in the truths of the Gospel, unless they could be proved by mathematical evidence. Multitudes, who would not make a declaration so unreasonable as that, still hesitate, and demand, if not a kind, still an amount of proof, or a freedom from difficulties, which from the nature of the case never can be furnished.

It is, indeed, proper to require adequate evidence before we can admit the Gospel as true and binding upon us, because of the wonderful facts which it propounds, its stupendous miraculous agency. But when they are attested by competent witnesses, when the supposition of their falsity would be a greater wonder than the miracle itself, then our want of belief may indicate something else and something more melancholy than absence of proof or inability to judge of evidence. Were man but partially depraved, were his depravity the mere product of habit or circum-

stances, were he in a condition of misfortune or misery merely, the provisions of the Gospel would assuredly meet at his hands a cordial welcome, because they are fitted most precisely to his nature and wants, because they unfold to him richer blessings, a nobler destiny than legend or fable ever invented, because they give him *here* an antepast of the royal feast that awaits him hereafter. Were his mind in the state in which that of a few heathen is said to have been on the first promulgation of the Gospel to them, he could hardly *wait* till the evidences might be spread out before him, — his heart would *rush* to embrace it. But the difficulty is, unrenewed men do not wish to come to the light lest their deeds should be reproved. The Gospel lays too heavy a tax on their pride; its demands clash with certain favorite plans or pursuits, and their continued unbelief is attributed to want of evidence, when it is really owing to an unwillingness to do what the Gospel imposes on every believer.

In the second place, an illustration of a deep-seated moral disorder may be drawn from the fact, that the Gospel morality, everywhere and by all classes of men eulogized, has not been by many, even in profession, much less in practice, adopted as the rule of life, even by those who have most loudly commended it. It is a well-known fact, that sceptics, men who have ridiculed the *doctrines* of the Gospel, the *system* of redemption, have separated its morality from it, have warmly approved, for example, of our Lord's sermon on the mount, and have seen much to admire in the personal character of the Saviour himself.

No one, indeed, with an ordinary degree of discernment, or with a common knowledge of human systems and of the state of the world, can fail to be struck with the pure and

sublime nature of the New Testament morality. But if so, why is it not made a matter of earnest and profound study, and of practical adoption as the rule of life? Certainly, it was not intended as an abstract and beautiful theory, the subject of analysis or of scientific consideration. It is a chart for the guidance of every individual who becomes acquainted with it. It is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart. Its jurisdiction is over the motives as well as the act. It addresses every reader and every hearer, as personally and deeply interested in its spirit and in all its provisions. It was made for *man*, weak, erring, sinful, beset with dangers. Still, it is notorious that all that large class of men to whom I refer, and who choose to consider it apart from that peculiar redeeming system out of which it grows, have *not* made it the rule of *their* life. They have, it may be, openly and formally renounced its claims, have considered it as having no practical, binding sanction whatever; or else they have passed it by in neglect, have never allowed it, through the care and pressure of other things, to disturb the even and quiet tenor of their life; or possibly they have selected parts of it, precepts which involved the least self-denial, or which accorded with their habits of thinking, or fell in with certain tendencies of their own, or which, severed from the system, would produce little practical effect; or it may be that they have at one time or another endeavored to cherish its spirit and obey its injunctions, but have found a sad inability to the task. The holy precept has awakened some before dormant opposition. Some antagonist power has aroused itself in the depths of their spirit; some long-slumbering energy of evil has started up alarmed, as if its rights were involved. In other words, there is a strange and unaccountable reluc-

tance honestly and implicitly to follow precepts which seem to be so fair in theory, and which commend themselves to all one's better judgments and feelings.

Now this total neglect of what is true and good, or this coming short of obedience to it, is accounted for only on *one* mournful and humiliating supposition. The Gospel morality does not find the heart *ready* to embrace it. The Saviour's precepts fall on thorny ground. As a practical system, it is inseparable from and subsequent to the cordial reception of those great doctrines which form the soul anew, and fit it to run in the way of God's commandments.

We may take, in the third place, a more specific fact, a general, if not universal, characteristic of our race ; namely, the preference of intellectual to moral worth, the undervaluing of goodness in comparison with talent. Of this fact there are proofs and illustrations innumerable. We are always deeply interested in the exhibition of commanding ability, as we ought to be ; but this leads us to overlook or extenuate *moral* delinquencies, as it ought not to do. If an individual, on a large or on a small scale, has shown extraordinary cunning and ingenuity, this is a cloak for a multitude of sins. The very quality which fits him to become a flagrant transgressor is to us, not simply an object of admiration, but the occasion of throwing a gloss over his crimes, and of lowering the standard of virtue. In God's view, the greater the talent which is enlisted in a *bad* cause, the more unmixed is the abhorrence which it should excite, and the more speedy and summary is the punishment which is due. A young man of extraordinary talents and genius, but of vicious moral principles, is almost always the idol of the circle in which he moves. The virtuous, while they theoretically condemn his course, are too apt to fall in with

the current eulogy, or at least to administer very lenient rebukes. How common it is for professedly religious people, especially in our large cities, to associate, on the most friendly terms, with one whose only title to their regard is superior talent, fascinating conversational power, or some other intellectual gift. Mere moral goodness, or the exhibition of virtue combined with only moderate mental ability, rarely attracts any special notice, even from those who would feel bound *formally* to subscribe to that standard, to which they are far from attaining in practice. How often is it said, such a one is a *good* man; such another is a man of strict moral integrity, but he is rather weak, or his mental endowments are quite moderate. The truth is stated, it may be, but in such a manner, and with such a tone, as to make the impression that virtue, benevolence, piety, are really of less consequence than splendid intellectual powers, or that the individual is really in fault for not exhibiting what he never possessed. This preference for intellectual endowment or attainment is so general, that it has passed into a notorious maxim; it is found to be safer, it is less wounding to personal pride, it will less endanger the maintenance of friendship, to deprecate the *moral* than the intellectual character. Calumny directed against the goodness of one's intentions, does not offend so much as that directed against the vigor or capacity of one's mind. Professing Christians are not by any means exempt from this weakness, this utterly erroneous standard of judgment. Humble worth, unobtrusive goodness, tender affection, incorruptible integrity, are scorned or undervalued, if they are not connected with commanding talent. We notice slightly, or ingeniously explain away, serious defects of a moral nature, provided the transgressor have an acute mind or a brilliant

genius. We put sagacity in the place of integrity. We deify qualities which man has in common with fallen spirits, while we make little account of that which, in the sight of the blessed angels, is beyond price.

It is hardly necessary to advert to any of the considerations which show the folly and erroneousness of this standard. What is it that is really attractive in the character of our Lord? Is it not his divine compassion? Is it not his true humanity, loving all that breathes, sympathizing with life wherever it is found? Is it not his ennobling affections, which neither time nor eternity could limit? Is it not his meekness, which would not break a bruised reed? his gentleness, for which his disciples could find no so apt emblem as the lamb and the dove? Can we form a more unworthy conception of his character, than that it was intellectual, apart from or predominating over the other qualities of his nature.

What is it that is principally attractive in the bliss of heaven? What developments of character are most impressive, where mere intellectual gifts have vanished away for ever? What is the source of the joy that fills the soul when first transplanted to those fair regions? That sweet singer, who lost his melancholy for a little moment, as he took down his harp and sung, in strains almost divine, of that day when rivers of gladness should water all the earth; what may we imagine to have been the source of *his* happiness, as he suddenly emerged from that cloud, which grew thicker to the last moment of his life? *Love*, doubtless, emotions of overwhelming love to that mighty Redeemer, who healed his wounded spirit, and gently drew him upward, and gave him the palm of victory, and a harp that would never again be silent or dissonant.

I adduce, in the fifth place, as an illustration of the subject, a species of false humility, which consists in the studied depreciation of one's self, accompanied with an entire unwillingness that *others* should *accord* with that severe judgment. We are willing to make the most ample confessions of our ignorance or unworthiness in general, or on specific points, provided others do not confirm or carry out this acknowledgment. This may be said to be a characteristic of the human race, natural to man, revealed in a thousand circumstances and relations. How often will parents allege facts implying the weakness or viciousness of their children, and yet they would be instantly and greatly offended, should a neighbor allude, even in delicate terms, to the same faults! The people of a portion of the country where a great moral evil exists will often speak of it in terms of decided reprehension, while they are utterly unwilling to allow others, who are not particularly connected with it, to reiterate this condemnation. The same is true in regard to the judgments which different nations frankly pronounce on themselves, but which they cannot tolerate if reëchoed from some foreign source.

Now if this self-condemnation be sincere, and if we be willing to reveal it to others, why should we hesitate to permit them to unite in the verdict? If it be not true in our opinion, why speak of it? If it be true, why this sensitiveness lest others should accord with our judgment? May it not be implied, that we do not really believe the charge ourselves, are not sincere in the confession? or that we are conscious that it has some foundation, and are desirous to *anticipate* and preclude a harsher or more detailed charge which might be made against us? or that possibly, in our self-deception, we attribute faults and weaknesses to our-

selves, in order that others may rebut the charge, and assure us that we are mistaken, that we have formed a too *low* opinion of ourselves? or, if there be some human infirmities cleaving to us, they lean to the side of virtue, while our characters are set off and adorned by some great and preponderating excellences? On no subject, perhaps, does the selfishness of man's heart exhibit more ingenuity, adopt a greater variety of shifts and devices, or reveal its essential turpitude, more strikingly than in this show of humility.

The point which I wish to illustrate is further confirmed, in the sixth place, by the general distrust of each other which prevails among men. In all business transactions, in all the varied routine of commercial dealings, in all the provisions of law relating to the subject, in all the current maxims of society, in all the counsels given to young men entering on business, the dishonesty of man is taken for granted; not the dishonesty of now and then an individual, but of men generally; not the dishonesty of Asiatics merely, but of Europeans and Americans; not the dishonesty of the people in the newly formed or unformed settlements, but in our oldest and most Christian towns and cities. Many of the provisions of commercial law are founded on the untrustworthiness of man, and are unintelligible without it, and the improvements in this law are owing in part to a more accurate and profound acquaintance with the records of human depravity.

Now it is not true to say, that these provisions are made necessary because it is necessary to guard against a possible contingency, or an occasional infraction of law. They are founded on the well-ascertained fact of the weakness of the moral principle, of the cogent and often invincible power of temptation, or, in other words, on the fact that the dishon-

esty, rather than the moral integrity, of man is to be taken for granted. The system of guards, restrictions, careful and minute specifications of what constitutes delinquency, is founded on the frailness of man's boasted integrity; it virtually recognizes what the Scriptures affirm, that men are filled with all unrighteousness, covetousness; that they are inventors of evil things, covenant-breakers. Otherwise, why is there not *some exception* to the necessity for these laws? Why, with advancing civilization, may not these laws become less stringent and comprehensive? Why do they not become a dead letter in those enlightened communities, where a high sense of what is just and honorable prevails? Why are caution, shrewdness, an unceasing watchfulness, indispensable to all, who would not be overreached, and who would succeed in the business of life?

I mention, in the last place, as an illustration of man's depravity, the careful exclusion in all courts of justice, in all ages of the world, so far as it is possible, of all interested testimony, the evidence of all persons who may be supposed to have a bias one way or the other. It is a rule of the Common Law, that "the power of giving testimony in their own cause is taken away from all persons." This rule is founded, not solely in the consideration of interest, but partly in the desire of avoiding the multiplication of temptations to perjury. Evidence is trustworthy, as a general thing, in proportion to the absence in the minds of the witnesses of all bias resulting from relationship, party interest, or pecuniary advantage. In this particular, the most conscientious individuals are not trusted. It is taken for granted that in the *best* of men the power of interest, or of lurking prejudice, or of unconscious tendencies, is so great, or, in other words,

the currents and ramifications of selfishness are so numerous, as to endanger or defeat the ends of justice. Without the most vigilant circumspection, no amount of sagacity, no degree of acquaintance with the subject, no reputation for strict integrity, will counterbalance this known and presupposed vicious tendency. And this is only one instance out of many which might be cited from the same source, to prove that the moral corruption of man is universal, and is taken for granted in every department of practical life, even by multitudes who theoretically deny it. Were men generally virtuous, were they governed in any good degree by disinterested benevolence, they would speak the truth, without an oath or with it, in secret or before their fellowmen, whether it made *for* their own interest or against it, whether a human tribunal took cognizance of it or not. Were they by personal infirmity or bad example exposed to bias or prejudice, they would set a tenfold watch on this vulnerable point, and choose to err, if at all, to the disadvantage of themselves or their party.

Such appear to be some of the presumptive arguments, or corroborating circumstances, for the truth of a doctrine, which the Scriptures so abundantly teach, and all human experience confirms.

The Apostle declares, that in the great day of judgment the whole world shall stand guilty before God. This sentence of self-condemnation might be anticipated. It does not require the blaze of that supernatural light to reveal the truth. The sentence is antedated in a thousand volumes, implied in the decisions of innumerable earthly tribunals, tacitly or openly acted upon in all the departments of life. That *man* is depraved and is worthy of condemnation, and that he openly confesses or really implies it, in relation to all

other men, is testified to by the individual consciousness; it is written in letters of blood on all history, and is constantly confirmed in the most convincing manner by undesigned and circumstantial proof.

Here we perceive the inestimable value of the Christian system. This system lays the axe at the root. It begins by breaking up the selfishness of our nature. It declares an exterminating war against that love of self which is the germ of all *other* vice. Philanthropy is its watchword, a world-wide compassion is the spirit which it breathes, unmerited crowns of glory are the reward which it offers.

More than this, it has precepts of the most definite and discriminating character; rules and provisions most perfectly fitted to meet all the Protean shapes and disguises under which selfishness hides itself. One fruit of a long and profound study of the Gospel is to convince us, not only of the subtle and manifold forms in which a sinful heart, deceitful above all things, may impose upon us, but of the wonderful adaptation of particular precepts to the specific types of this moral disease, tracking it in all its symptoms, and administering the antidote at the very point where it will be most efficacious.

But more than this; it reveals a Saviour who was *love* embodied; who furnished an ideal higher than the human imagination could ever conceive, of disinterested love, goodwill incarnate; a character complete in all its parts, yet individual and attractive in all its shades and particulars. It is by serious and profound meditation on the life and love of Jesus, by musing on this great example, living and dying for others, by copying largely of his spirit, that we shall become *assimilated* to Him who is fairer than the children of men, and shall gain a perfect and final triumph over all the powers of evil by which we are beset.

INFLUENCE OF EMINENT PIETY ON THE INTELLECTUAL POWERS.*

THERE is an impression somewhat general, even at the present day, that a vigorous and highly cultivated intellect is not consistent with distinguished holiness; and that those who would live in the clearest sunshine of communion with God must withdraw from the bleak atmosphere of human science. We are warned very frequently against the doctrine of the sufficiency of reason, and earnestly reminded of the importance of simplicity in the consideration of the truths of the Gospel. That there are melancholy examples of an unhumbled and boastful spirit among the students of Revelation, we do not deny. It must be acknowledged, that pride and presumption often usurp the place of humility and reverence.

But is there not another tendency equally deplorable? Is there not an opposite extreme, which is no less injurious? Are we not apt to dissociate the intellect from the heart, to array knowledge and piety against each other, to exalt the feelings at the expense of the judgment, and to create the

* This Essay was originally published in the Christian Review, Vol. V. pp. 1–22.

impression extensively, that eminent attainments in knowledge and grace are incompatible ?

Piety, it must be remembered, is not an isolated and barren principle; it is not a sickly plant growing under the shadow of the understanding. It is rather the rain and the light from which the intellect derives nourishment and strength. Those who assert or imagine, that a weak and unfurnished mind is the most genial soil for piety, affirm that of which they are ignorant, and slander that which they cannot comprehend.

It is our object, in the present Essay, to maintain the position, that eminent piety has an important and salutary influence on the mental powers; that soundness of the understanding is promoted by goodness of the heart; or, in other words, that the performance of duty towards God contributes to the improvement and expansion of the mind.

1. The teaching of the Scriptures on this point is clear and decisive. They uniformly connect holiness with knowledge, both in their historical facts and preceptive instructions. Why did God select Moses to be the lawgiver and guide of his people during their forty years' pilgrimage? Why did he confer on one man, for nearly half a century, powers almost absolute? Not because the Levite was slow of speech; not because he was a meek man, any further than his meekness was a qualification for his work. Moses was *learned* in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, as well as in that practical experience which he had acquired in his long sojourn in the deserts of Arabia. A man was demanded for the service, of great powers of mind, ready to meet emergencies, whose acknowledged talents would overawe the fractious multitude, whose clear intellect, coöperating with the Divine teaching, could frame a wise system

of laws, and also enable him to act as the only historian of the world for almost one half of its duration thus far. God did not alight upon Moses by accident. He *selected* him as probably the only man in the nation competent to the work. Again, why were the principal writers of the Old Testament taken from the most intelligent men of their times, some of them priests, who were required to be educated? Moses, David, Solomon, Isaiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, the writer of the book of Job, considered merely in an intellectual point of view, would have been the glory of any age.

It is sometimes said that Christ chose illiterate fishermen to be the principal promulgators of his religion. But does this imply that they were men of feeble powers of intellect? Was Luke deficient in ability to investigate his subject, and present it in an appropriate and original style? Was not James (the author of the Epistle) a very close observer of men, and has he not a very characteristic manner? Illiterate most of them were, in the Jewish sense of the term. They were not profound doctors of the law; they were not learned Gamaliels in the traditions of the elders; but they were men of sound sense, and, in one respect, well educated, for who ever equalled their teacher? He that labored more than they all, who wrote the greater part of the doctrinal compositions of the New Testament, — why was he selected for his extraordinary mission? Doubtless because God is wise in fitting means to ends. He chose to convert a man of a most strongly marked character, in order to do a strongly marked work. He could have turned one of the stones in the streets of Tarsus into a foreign missionary. He could have inspired the feeblest intellect in Judea to wield the eloquence of an angel. But he preferred to take

Apollos, who had been well instructed in the preparatory dispensation of John, and who could *reason* mightily with the Jews. It is in uniform accordance with God's arrangement to do nothing unnecessary; he employs and strengthens existing instrumentalities, rather than creates new ones.

The wise and noble, whom Paul mentions as having been cast off by the Almighty, were wise in their *own* conceit. He has particular reference, probably, to the sophists, who were numerous, at that time, in the Grecian cities, and who were as destitute of common sense and of true knowledge as they could well be; men who possessed hardly any thing but acuteness, or a wire-drawn subtilty; fine prototypes of the hair-splitters and angelical doctors of a later age. If these sophists had entered the Church, they would have filled it with their empty wranglings.

Instead of dissevering knowledge from religion, the Bible is fraught with instructions to the contrary. "Give me understanding, and I shall observe thy law with my whole heart. Teach me knowledge and good judgment. O, how love I thy law! it is my meditation all the day. The entrance of thy word giveth light; it giveth understanding to the simple." Paul exhorts his disciples to the constant study of the new religion, on the ground that in the mystery of Christ, which in other ages was not made known to the children of men, there were contained all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. He directs them to strengthen themselves with might in the *inner* man, that they may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height of the love of Jesus. He declares that every Christian, in proportion as he is indeed a Christian, has received the Spirit, that searcheth all things, yea, even the *deep* things of God. He proceeds further

still; he terms the doctrines of faith, repentance, the resurrection of the dead, and eternal judgment, the *elementary* lessons, food for babes, and reprimands his disciples for not having advanced into the *mysteries* of their religion.

These passages have a primary reference, unquestionably, to religious knowledge, or to the employment of the mind on religious subjects. But they cannot be considered as excluding other kinds of knowledge. They require by implication, if not directly, that degree of culture and enlargement of the mental powers, which is necessary to comprehend the deeper mysteries of the Christian faith. They also imply that the study of these mysteries must have a beneficial effect on the mind. Else godliness would not be profitable for all things. One of the principal things would be excluded from its benign influence.

2. Eminent piety must exert a favorable effect on the mind from the nature of piety itself. True religion cannot exist without a degree of knowledge. It cannot grow without a corresponding growth in knowledge. "It is impossible," remarks a distinguished writer, "that the affections should be kept constant to an object which gives no employment to the understanding. The energies of the intellect, increase of insight, and enlarging views, are necessary to keep alive the substantial faith in the heart. They are the appointed fuel to the sacred fire." * Instances there are, indeed, of persons in lowly life, of uncommon apparent spirituality and elevation of religious feeling, who possess but a moderate degree of intelligence. Yet such are diligent readers of the Bible, and they are accustomed to estimate highly the scanty knowledge of secular subjects

* See Coleridge's Lay Sermons.

with which they are favored. On the contrary, the individuals who have wrought the greatest mischief in the Church of Christ are those who were, at first, regarded as eminently pious, that is, possessed of ardent emotions and of burning zeal, but who were accustomed to clamor against human learning, to throw contempt on a properly trained ministry, and disparage religious truth, as distinguished from religious feeling.

A common definition of eminent piety is this: "An entire consecration to God, a devotement of all the faculties to his service." Yet many Christians would seem to take the faculties in their *existing* state, whatever that may be, as thus to be dedicated. But our Master requires whatever we *can* be, as well as what we *are*. He demands the *attainable*, as well as the *attainment*, the possible, as well as the existing. The hope, the aspiration, the strenuous endeavor, the fresh acquisition, belong to him. Why has he given us the principle of intellectual curiosity? Most certainly that he might stimulate us in the path of intellectual and religious knowledge. If we stifle this curiosity, if we bury it up, if we have not an enthusiasm even, in the occupying of all the talents with which God has endued us, then we are not consecrating ourselves to him. We do not give him our best offerings. We withhold the freshest fruits. We present the stale manna of yesterday. The great mass of people in a Christian country are placed in a situation where constant advance in knowledge, more or less, is an indispensable duty. But in the degree that we neglect or lightly esteem the cultivation of our intellectual powers, we are not (so far as an essential element is concerned) in the process of attaining eminent piety. We are inclined to shut out every thing of this nature from the

supervision of conscience; we do not feel the emotion of remorse, unless there be some *overt* act, or some *moral* delinquency. Our powers of mind may run utterly waste, and yet the conscience take no cognizance. We have hid a part of our Lord's money in a napkin.

The idea of eminent piety which floats in the public mind is limited to a single ingredient, namely, fervent emotion, the possession, and particularly the display, of strong feeling. We read the diaries of distinguished saints, and we estimate their holiness according to the number of passages in which rapturous *emotion* is expressed. Such passages are contagious. In reading them, our sympathies are excited, and so far we are incapable of judging in respect to the more silent and unobtrusive marks of eminent sanctification. Doubtless emotion is *one* of the principal constituents of true religion. Without a degree of it, piety, of course, must be wholly wanting. Our spiritual relations are such in their nature as to awaken the deepest feelings of which man is capable. A clear idea of God *must* fill the soul with the profoundest reverence. The love of Jesus *must* stir every bosom which is not colder than ice. That man is insane, so far as this matter is concerned, who is not pervaded with solemn awe, in contemplating an eternal, personal existence in heaven or in hell. Still, emotion is but one of the ingredients of eminent spirituality. We have no right to make this the only test of an elevated Christian. There are other essential characteristics, essential to a high degree of holiness, if not to its existence in any measure. By limiting the characteristics of distinguished piety to one or two things, however important these may be, we undervalue the influence of knowledge, and diminish too much the number of eminently pious men.

We degrade from that rank some individuals who are fully entitled to it, men of uncommon intellectual endowments and acquisitions, and whose piety may be regarded with suspicion because it has not all the fervency which men of smaller intellectual powers might have exhibited. Some of the hidden or less notorious qualities of piety, which we are accustomed to overlook, are among the most important in their bearing on the mental faculties. It may be pertinent, therefore, briefly to advert to them.

One of these qualities might be termed *humanity*, the possession of humane sentiments, tenderness, generosity, disinterestedness. The Apostle Peter refers to it, when he enjoins on his disciples to be pitiful, to be courteous. We too often see individuals who make loud and boastful professions of piety, who are, notwithstanding, hard-hearted ; generous, possibly, in their conduct towards some persons, morose or neglectful in relation to others ; earnest in their proffers of friendship, deficient in real kindness ; liberal in their contributions towards the general spread of the Gospel, but whose benevolence is not of good report in their own neighborhood.* That tendency in our fallen nature which induces us to place reliance on a doctrinal creed, or on a zealous temperament, in the neglect of humane sentiments and of a generous disposition, is the reason why the Apostles so earnestly admonish their disciples on the subject.

Nearly allied to this disposition, and perhaps a result of it, is candor in judgment, — a habit of putting a charitable construction upon the motives of our fellow-men ; the ab-

* We have a well-authenticated statement respecting an orthodox professor of Christianity, who declined to assist a neighbor's family involved in distress, on the ground of the heterodoxy of a member of that family.

sence of bigotry and exclusiveness; a resolute determination to judge of books, of systems of knowledge, and of men, with discriminating kindness. No one ought to be considered as eminently pious, who is rash and overbearing in his moral or literary judgments. If his piety does not enter into and control these matters, it is one-sided and partial. We are not required, indeed, to remain ignorant of the deficiencies of our neighbors and friends; but we are required to throw the mantle of charity over their faults, and to maintain, in all our intercourse with them, the character of Christian gentlemen. Now these illiberal judgments and uncourteous feelings are intimately connected with a narrow understanding and with confined intellectual opinions. The natural tendency of enlarged views and of extensive and patient reading, is to break down the barriers of party, and of a selfish bigotry, while it refines and ennobles the soul.

Distinguished piety is conscientious. It implies an habitual performance of the smaller duties of life; a careful attention to the thousand minute occurrences of every day. It implies a wakeful moral sensibility, a delicate spiritual perception, an instinctive shrinking from the remotest contact with evil. Some individuals, who have been regarded as eminently pious, appear to have been very imperfectly controlled by their conscience. It took cognizance of the presumptuous sin. It laid its authority on the outbreaking enormity. But it slept over unnumbered nameless delinquencies. It did not utter its warning in the incipient stages of transgression. In such cases the conscience is not enlightened by knowledge. It is in a state of comparative eclipse.

In forming an estimate of what constitutes eminent piety, we sometimes err in not making sufficient allowance for

diversities of natural character. We erect a standard, and determine that all men shall conform to it. We fabricate one suit of armor, and compel David and Saul alike to wear it. But there are innocent temperaments, diverse in different individuals, all of which we would extinguish. If we had our will, there would be one dull, tasteless uniformity in the character of our piety, eminent though it might be. But distinguished holiness is consistent with the countless varieties of innocent natural temperament. That development of thought and feeling which in one man would be at war with his religious consistency, would be perfectly in unison with it in another, because it would be in accordance with the man and his general spirit.

Richard Baxter somewhere remarks, that at one period he entertained doubts in relation to the experimental character of the piety of Sir Matthew Hale, inasmuch as the judge was inclined, in his almost daily conversation with Baxter, to dwell upon abstract truth, or on speculative opinion, with scarcely an allusion to personal, religious feeling. Baxter was subsequently convinced, however, that he had formed an erroneous judgment. It would have been incongruous in Hale to have copied the ardent manner of Baxter. His unimpeachable integrity as a judge, his conscientious observance of the Sabbath day, were better proofs of eminent piety than any conversational powers could have been. Hale kept himself unspotted from the world in the court of Charles II. Could Baxter, or any other man, have done more ?

3. The beneficial effects of piety on the human mind may be argued from facts. It has been contended, indeed, that distinguished holiness is of no importance to the mind,

or is even positively injurious, from the circumstance that the intellectual powers have been cultivated in a high degree by many individuals who did not possess eminent piety, or, indeed, any piety whatever. Their interest in literary studies, it is said, was not distracted by religious duties. Their time was not wasted by the agitating, never-ceasing conflict between the natural inclinations and the renewed nature, — a conflict of which Christians complain so much. They could give an undivided attention to the culture of the intellect.

Some of these allegations cannot, of course, be denied. The mind may be disciplined by him who has no fear of God before his eyes, just in the same way that riches may be acquired by one who never acknowledges his dependence on an overruling Providence. A politician may have an insatiable desire to attain a place of honor. In order to accomplish his object, he must lay in large intellectual treasures. The hand of the diligent maketh rich. The hand of the diligent maketh learned also. It is possible that in some cases there may be such a total slumber of the moral faculty, that the intellect will proceed undisturbed in its movements, and may thus reach a more extraordinary growth when the affections are withered or scorched, just as the soil which has been burned over may send up a quicker and more luxuriant vegetation.

There are several considerations, however, which deserve attention before we conclude that eminent piety would have no influence in the case. It has never been proved that those distinguished writers, who are unfriendly to Christianity, might not have been more distinguished, if they had felt the power of the religion which they opposed. If Gibbon had had an experimental acquaintance with Christianity,

would he not have better understood various portions of the historical ground over which he travelled? Are not some of his prominent and acknowledged defects owing to his prejudices on this subject? Would David Hume have been a less acute metaphysician, had he possessed the spirit of Robert Boyle? Christianity makes no war on those mental characteristics for which Hume was celebrated. It gives free passage to the sharpest intellect, while it would suppress that dishonesty, that love of entangling sophistry, which were a real injury to Hume's mind, and always will be to his reputation. His works are deficient in dignity. They betray many marks of having come from a laughing philosopher, to whom life was a pleasant riddle, and eternity an ingenious phantom. Faith in the realities of a future state would have imparted a grandeur to Hume's speculations, which would have been of immense benefit to them in a mere literary point of view. He would also have had some sympathy for his fellow-men, some interest in the well-being of his race. Religion would have divested him of that freezing indifference to the struggles of humanity which so strongly marks the pages of his great history.

Again, some men of the most hopeful intellect have felt it to be their duty to employ their whole time in practical exertions for the benefit of their fellow-men. They might have become rich in all literary acquisitions, if they had not chosen to *go about* doing good. Such men as Buchanan, Martyn, and Charles Wolfe might have acquired a reputation in certain departments of knowledge as notorious as that of the apostles of infidelity. These last were subject to no such drawback. They were never guilty of a too lavish expenditure of beneficent action.

Furthermore, the few individuals on whom the richest

gifts of intellect have been bestowed, and who have toiled most earnestly in their improvement, in other words, the great lights of our race, Bacon, Newton, Kepler, Copernicus, Galileo, Pascal, Boyle, who possessed not merely a derived knowledge of the laws of nature which others had disclosed, but who themselves discovered the laws, — all these were religious men. Some of them, as Kepler, Boyle, and Pascal, were distinguished for the strength and elevation of their piety.* The insight into the structure of the universe which they obtained was a means of grace. Intellect and piety mutually and beneficially acted and reacted.

In relation to other great, but, in comparison with the last named, inferior ornaments of science, who were unfriendly to Christianity, it seems to have been satisfactorily shown, † that they were mere logicians or mathematicians, of deductive rather than of inductive habits, who rested in the laws of the universe as the ultimate and all-sufficient principles, who thrust in, as the poet says, some mechanic cause in the place of God, instead of lifting themselves to the source of

---

* Decided indications of piety are found in the letters and published treatises of Galileo. Religious reflections occur even in the mathematical writings of Copernicus. Kepler was a man of ardent piety. "This beautiful system of sun, planets, and comets," remarks Newton, "could have its origin in no other way than by the purpose and command of an intelligent and powerful Being. He governs all things, not as the soul of the world, but as the Lord of the universe." The eminent piety of Pascal is well known. Many of Boyle's Dissertations convey trains of thought and reasoning which have never been surpassed for their combination of judicious sobriety in not pressing his arguments too far, with fervent devotion in his conceptions of the Divine nature. See his Essay entitled "The High Veneration Man's Intellect owes to God." — *Whewell's Bridgewater Treatise*, p. 235.

† Whewell, p. 244.

all laws and principles. If the mathematical philosopher dwells in his own bright land of deductive reasoning, till he turns with disgust from all the speculations necessarily less clear and conclusive, in which his imagination, his practical faculties, his moral sense, his capacity of religious hope and belief, are to be called into action, he becomes, more than common men, liable to miss the road to truths of the highest value.* So far their views are narrowed, and they become incapable of judging of moral evidence. Nothing, however, is gained to the cause of Christianity by depreciating such men, by branding them as sciolists or superficial reasoners. They were great men without Christianity. But if they had come directly and fully under its influence, they would have been greater still. Religion is not an enemy to mathematics; but she is an enemy to all prejudice, to every exclusive tendency, to every thing which would confine the mind to one mode of development, at the expense of its general and symmetrical advancement.

* Bonaparte observed of Laplace, when he was called to a public office of considerable importance, that he did not discharge it in so judicious and clear-sighted a manner as his high intellectual fame might lead most men to expect. "He sought subtilties in every subject, and carried into his official employments the spirit of the method of infinitely small quantities." A very respectable mathematician of the Roman Catholic Church, said that it was the "business of the Sorbonne to discuss; of the Pope to decide; and of the mathematician to go to heaven in a perpendicular line." Dugald Stewart, in quoting this last anecdote, remarks, that while mathematical studies exercise the faculty of reasoning or deduction, they give no employment to the other powers of the understanding concerned in the investigation of truth. The atheism and materialism professed by some of the French mathematicians, is to be ascribed, in the opinion of Mr. Stewart, to a *credulity* as blind as that of their predecessors who trusted in the dogmas of an infallible Church. — *Stewart*, Vol. III. p. 193.

While, therefore, it is not denied that the human mind is cultivated in a high degree, without, or even in opposition to, Christianity, still it can be maintained by facts, that the influence of this religion is decidedly favorable upon the intellect directly. All minds in the highest class, the discoverers, have gladly acknowledged its power. Nearly all the original geniuses in another department, that of imagination, have likewise borne the same testimony. Its witnesses in every other field of human knowledge rise up by thousands.* The argument, so far as any can be drawn from this source, is mainly on the side of Christianity.

4. The eminent Christian, other things being equal, is the most diligent student of the works and of the word of God. Such study is well fitted to enlarge and liberalize the mind. We are placed in a creation adapted to awaken the deepest interest. The works of God *are* marvellous;

* Thus we may add, that some of the ablest historians, antiquarians, and linguists, now living on the continent of Europe, are firm believers in Divine revelation. We may mention Professor Charles Ritter, of Berlin, probably the first geographical writer of the present or of any age, who is no less remarkable for his unaffected piety than for his profound and various learning. The late Baron De Sacy, the acknowledged head of Oriental scholars, was not ashamed, in the midst of an evil and atheistic generation, to profess his cordial trust in the Saviour of the world. "If my conduct," he says, "has not always been, as I humbly acknowledge, conformable to the sacred rules which my faith enjoins, those faults have never been with me the effect of any doubt of the truth of the Christian religion, or of its divine origin. I firmly trust that they will be forgiven me, through the mercy of my Heavenly Father, in virtue of the sacrifice of Jesus Christ my Saviour, not putting my confidence in any merit of my own, and confessing from the bottom of my heart, that in myself I am nothing but weakness, misery, and wretchedness." — *Asiatic Journal.*

they are *sought out* by all who have pleasure therein. And who can refrain from having this pleasure? Who can be an indifferent spectator, amid the changes which are going on around him? Instead of wonder that some men are willing to toil a life long in the study of the works of God, the wonder is that *all* men are not captivated with the pursuit. These studies are called the natural sciences; they are rather divine sciences; they are fitted to move the mind of man to its lowest depths. Whoever hath an ear may hear. The dull rock has a voice; the dry leaf has a sound; the shell on the ocean's shore is not dumb. It is made according to certain laws. It fulfils its destiny with unerring precision. We may be lost in general admiration while gazing on it; or we may scientifically analyze it as a piece of consummate art. Now the earth is full of such objects. The common Christian may become acquainted with them, and through them adore their Creator. The Christian scholar will find in these objects inexhaustible themes for delightful contemplation. God invites him, and a thousand voices from his works reiterate the invitation. The doors of universal nature are before him. Has he not a key in his own mind to unlock them all? No assignable limit can be set to the material universe. Can any assignable limit be placed on the powers of the contemplating agent? Again, the Christian has a large accession to the objects of his knowledge in the Bible. That which is indispensably necessary to salvation is simple, and easily acquired. But revelation does not stop here. It awakens the curiosity of man to the highest degree by what it does not disclose. It touches on themes which it does not exhibit in full. It necessarily glances at topics which are beyond mortal comprehension. In describing what is known, or

what may be known, it alludes to topics which are neither discovered nor discoverable. In portraying the facts which are necessary for man, it does not absolutely conceal those which are not necessary. There are fragments of truth, gleams of light, half-revealed thoughts, which are precisely fitted to awaken our interest because of the very mystery in which they are involved. While engaged in such subjects, will not the mind of the investigator be strengthened? Will not the growth of his intellectual faculties correspond to the dignity and importance of the themes on which they are habitually occupied?

5. The powers of the mind, in order to their complete development, need to be under strict control. The eminent Christian will be more likely than other persons to maintain this discipline. We will adduce one or two illustrations of the remark.

There are two kinds of connection between our thoughts and feelings. There is an accidental, fortuitous succession of ideas, connected together only by extraneous and unimportant circumstances of resemblance or juxtaposition in time or place. When, on the other hand, certain habits of mind have been formed and settled by exercise and application, they displace and supersede, to a great extent, the law of casual association.* The accidental course of ideas is no longer followed, but their real and rational connection one with another is maintained. Now the eminently pious man does not allow his mind to run in every channel to which a wayward fancy may lead. His religious habits have enabled him to exercise control, to a greater or less

* See Isaac Taylor's Elements of Thought.

degree, over his trains of thought. There is some rationality and closeness in the connections which have been formed in his mind. He is accustomed to read the Bible with fixed attention, and to meditate on the most important truths regularly and thoroughly. Will his intellectual powers receive no benefit in the process? Will he not learn to think of every subject according to its just and proper relations; or, in other words, will not the ideas which follow in his mind be successively those which in fact and nature are most nearly related?

Again, the imagination is a power which is subject to irregular and unhealthful action. It is given us for wise and beneficent purposes. We are enabled by it to lift our hearts above the vanities of this earthly state. Its cherished home is among the sublime realities of the future. It helps to support the soul in its wearisome progress through the valley of the shadow of death. It clothes the doctrines of Christianity in an impressive and attractive form. One of its offices is to embody the intimations of immortality which are within us and around us. It imparts dignity to the meanest earthly pursuit, connecting it with the recompense of rewards. But this faculty is extremely liable to derangement. It may become disproportionate, and so unhealthful in its influence. It may retard, rather than animate, the progress of the Christian traveller. By its perversions it may render him gloomy or discontented. The eminent Christian will, however, resist this temptation. He will reduce this power, so mighty for good or for ill, into subjection, and teach it to do, unrepiningly, its appropriate work. Thus, while the themes of his habitual contemplation furnish the best nutriment for a vigorous and chastened imagination, a safeguard against its inordinate or irregular ac-

tion will be found in the supremacy of his conscience, and in those fixed moral habits without which distinguished holiness cannot exist.

6. The eminently pious man has before his mind, uniformly, an illustrious example of intellectual and moral excellence in Jesus Christ. This example is the mark of his calling. It is the summit of his wishes and aims. It is the goal to which all his exertions tend. The *spiritual* effect of placing such an object before one cannot but be obvious. It must exert an ennobling and purifying influence on the affections and the moral nature. But its bearing on the *intellectual* powers is not less striking. This may be illustrated in two ways.

First, all the great masters in the arts and sciences have ever had an ideal of excellence, — a conception, perhaps dim, of something absolutely perfect, — a form of matchless beauty floating before their imagination, towards which they could not help but strive, though conscious that they should never grasp it. This was the picture before the minds of the orators of antiquity; the *aliquid immensum infinitumque;* the good, the true, the beautiful, which belongs not to the Platonic philosophy alone, but to every philosophy in which there is any truth. One of the most eminent pulpit orators of the present age remarked, that he was constantly tormented with the desire of writing better than he could. This image may be indistinct. It is not necessary that it should be clearly apprehended, in all its proportions, in order that it should exert an influence. Some truths which are dimly conceived, may be any thing but impotent. For example, there is a general expectation in the irreligious community of a future judgment. Its defi-

nite purport is not clearly seen. But in the way of restraint and alarm, its influence cannot be measured. Thus, also, when the human soul is first awakened from its death of trespasses and sins, it may have no *vivid* apprehension of the glories of heaven or the terrors of hell, or of the turpitude of transgression. It is possessed by a solemn yet indistinct thought of eternity, of an endless duration. This general idea of retribution, however, gradually withdraws the mind that cherishes it from the vanities of time to the certainties of eternity.

So it is with him whose contemplations and love are fixed on the Lord Jesus. He has a perception more or less clear, of illustrious merit, of an excellence to which human language is wholly inadequate. Must not this habitual contemplation exert a great influence on the *intellect*? Is it possible to love such a being as Jesus Christ with benefit to the religious feelings simply? Will not the mental powers gradually become conscious of strength and elevation? In moments of depression, under the care of this earthly life, the absolute perfection of the Saviour, the glorious ideal, in this case embodied, comes in as a refreshment to the spirit. It does not operate as a discouragement, because unattainable by man; because the garland is on a height to which no mortal has reached. Such is the nature of the human soul, that it needs to have absolute perfection before it. In the struggle to gain what it cannot gain fully, it grows, rises, and is happy. One of the most fruitful sources of misery on earth is that we reach so many objects after which we aspire.

Secondly, our Saviour is an immediate and palpable object of imitation. He has qualities which can be most distinctly apprehended, and whose influence in the formation

of the religious character of his disciples can be measured and understood. But does not this process of assimilation affect the intellect strongly? Suppose a Harmony of the four Gospels is read with patience and prayer, and with a decided intention of accurately studying the character of Jesus. What would be the results? A deep impression of the mystery involved would, doubtless, be one thing; that there is something about his movements strangely inexplicable. We should also be impressed with the originality of his character as a man. It is human, and yet not human. It is what man ought to be, not what he is. The character is perfectly natural and unaffected, and yet it is not human. Christ, doubtless, acted and looked as no man else has done. Yet he was full of humanity. Though clothed in spotless holiness, yet he was eminently attractive as a brother and friend. Awful fear was not the prevailing passion which he excited. His disciples evidently loved him with an earthly love. They were attached to him as they would have been to a familiar teacher. We imagine how he would look, and how he would address us. We do not conceive of him as reserved in his conversation, and as forbidding in his demeanor, but as simple, frank, kind, winning, and gentle. His dignity was that of perfect nature and of perfect truth. Intimacy with him must be attended with the greatest *intellectual* benefits. In Jesus, as a man, we have the most entire confidence. We yield ourselves to him without reserve, with the delightful assurance that we are safe in so doing. In such communion, it is difficult to tell whether the intellect or the heart receives the greater benefit. Both grow in perfect harmony and proportion. The eminently pious man has intimate communion with his Saviour. Consequently, other things being equal, he will possess the

strongest and most fruitful intellect. It cannot but be so. He approaches the fountain of knowledge. He has only to open his mind, and influences sweeter than all the gums of Arabia will flow in upon him. He that walketh with wise men will be wise. What wisdom must not he acquire who walks with Jesus?

This conclusion accounts for the circumstance, which has been frequently remarked, that individuals of moderate capacities, even some whose obtuseness of intellect was matter of general notoriety, are emancipated, on becoming new creatures in Christ Jesus, from their mental thraldom. The old intellect has passed away. Behold, all things, intellectually, become new. A rustic apathy gives place to wakeful inquisitiveness. The vacant and sleepy eye is illuminated with new life. This is owing, in part, to the interest with which they study the character of Jesus. They find something in the Gospels particularly congenial to their tastes. They wonder at the gracious words which Christ addressed to just such sinners as themselves, and while they wonder, they are sweetly drawn to him in pure affection; and while thus attracted, they feel the chains of ignorance dropping from around them. They gradually penetrate deeper into the mysteries of redemption, while, at every step, new views break in upon them, and fresh capacity is added to them.

7. The man of distinguished holiness will be under the influence of the strongest motives for the improvement of his mind. One of these is love to Christ. He feels that it is but a little which he can do for his Saviour. His noblest offerings will fall far short of what is meet. He knows that he cannot worthily praise him to whom he owes all his

blessings. Still he would serve his Saviour with the best which he has. He would devote to him that on which he sets the highest value, the products of his rational nature. He can send up no richer incense than that which rises from the altar of a cultivated and consecrated understanding. He will feel a restless desire to augment these offerings as much as possible, to make all practicable intellectual attainments for the purpose of honoring his Redeemer. When he thinks of the love which has paid the price of his rescue, he has a sense of profound regret that he has so abused those faculties which might have been employed in spreading abroad that Saviour's love.

Another commanding motive is an impression of his accountableness. He is acting under the eye of an omniscient witness. He is every moment drawing nearer to the last assize. The questions are even now sounding in his ears: "My inspiration gave you understanding; how have you employed that understanding? Memory was my gift; did you enfeeble it in sin? I intrusted you with noble powers of reasoning; were they patiently cultivated and worthily used? I gave you imagination that you might rise above the cares of earth. I placed you, a rational and immortal spirit, amid my creation, radiant with beauty, filled with all objects which can touch the heart and stir the intellect. Did you madly shut your eyes on this creation? I spread out before you the revelations of my own eternity. Were you a thoughtful student of these revelations? I made you in my own moral and intellectual image. Have you mutilated and defaced that image?"

Such are the questions which a serious Christian will propound to himself, as he is going on to the judgment. He cannot hide his Lord's talents. He is to give an account

for all his intellectual deeds and omissions; for all which he might have accomplished, but which he failed to do, through indolence, false modesty, irresolution, or through dread of being stigmatized as ambitious and aspiring.

Benevolence to his fellow-men is a constraining motive. He sees a world of *mind* buried in midnight darkness, — millions alienated from their Creator by wicked works. He is penetrated with grief. His heart is filled with compassion for their woes. But mere grief will not rescue them. Blind compassion will not lead them to the Saviour. Under God, they are to be saved by sanctified *intellect*. Mind is to act on mind. Rational agents are to be plied with all possible motives by rational agents. Consecrated learning is the engine to raise up the whole pagan world from the night of ages into newness of life. The more of such learning, the better. The richer the missionary is freighted with it, the more beautiful are his feet on the mountains. Why was Claudius Buchanan so honored and so able an instrument in the evangelization of India? Because he studied mathematics thoroughly at Oxford. Why could Henry Martyn translate the word of life into Persian, and stand up alone, a fearless defender of the divinity of the Son of God in the midst of taunting and angry Moslems? Because Henry Martyn had studied the languages thoroughly at Cambridge. Not that mere mathematics and languages made these men so useful. It was love to the souls of the perishing which led them forth. But it was this same love that induced them to dig deep into human learning. Without knowledge they would not have become eminent missionaries. Just in proportion as a Christian has a comprehensive and accurate acquaintance with the pagan world or with Christendom, and just in proportion as he is desirous

to be instrumental in saving men, in the same proportion will he wish to be furnished with intellectual acquisitions. Scope will be found for his widest attainments.

Our general purpose in this Essay, we trust, will not be misinterpreted. The impression may, possibly, be communicated, that the intellect and human learning have been lauded at the expense of humble and warm-hearted piety. Such an impression, it is almost needless to say, would be erroneous. Our intention has been precisely the reverse. Certain aspects in the state of the world, or some important facts in the providence of God, have been among the motives which have induced us to write this Essay; facts which, in our opinion, call upon the enlightened Christian to review the ground on which he stands, in connection with the general spread of Christianity.

One of these facts is the cessation, to some extent, of religious controversy. For many years the war raged in almost every division of the Christian Church. There is now, at least, a little calm. There are some auspicious harbingers of a brighter day. There is an increasing number of men in most of the denominations, who are heartily weary of studying the tactician's manual, and of blowing the hoarse trumpet of the partisan. It would seem that this generation has had experience enough of controversies, most of which have been already fought over a thousand times. May there not be an opening for a better time? May there not be a ten years' truce? Cannot Christianity now take a decided step in advance? May there not be a new development of her benign influence? Is it too much to hope, that men, wearied with their fruitless and barren logomachies, will turn to the great mysteries of redemption, will

study these profoundly, will become enriched with heavenly wisdom, will present to the unbelieving world a higher style of Christianity, will show everywhere, and at all times, that union of sanctified affections, candid judgment, and elevated views, which grows legitimately out of their religion, and which nothing on earth can resist? Is such a hope fallacious?

> "This dire perverseness, we cannot choose but ask,
> Shall it endure? Shall enmity and strife,
> Falsehood and guile, be left to sow their seed,
> And the kind never perish?"

Again, when our theological seminaries were founded, twenty or thirty years since, it was confidently predicted, that a radical acquaintance with the original languages of the Bible, and a scientific study of its doctrines, would introduce a new era in the history of the Church; that Christianity would at once assume a more interesting form, especially in respect to the harmony of views with which it would be studied, and the union of practical effort to which this study would lead. Have all these hopes been realized? There are between one and two thousand clergymen now living in the United States, who were educated at these seminaries. What are they doing? Was the original expectation unreasonable? Is not the study of the original Scriptures fitted to produce the good fruits which were predicted? We fully believe that it is. And we as fully believe, that the partial failure has been particularly owing to the cause which has been discussed in this article, — the want of a union of sound understanding and of elevated views with pure and ardent affections. These things have been mournfully dissociated in the ministry. It is an impression, somewhat general, that an intellectual clergyman

is deficient in piety, and that an eminently pious minister is deficient in intellect. It has not been understood sufficiently, that the element in which the intellect can best attain its growth, is earnest piety, and that earnest piety cannot maintain an existence independently of knowledge. Hence, too, we may account for much of the bigotry, the censoriousness, the impetuous temper, the tendency to rush to extremes, the withdrawment from fields of appropriate labor, and the unsettled state of the pastoral office, which have certainly characterized our generation. It has not been remembered that, in a minister of Christ, there can be no substitute for a constant advance in knowledge. He *must* grow in knowledge, as well as in grace. There is no alternative. A settled determination in the great body of the ministry to adhere to their proper work in the place where they are first settled, to explore the original of the Scriptures in all its exuberant richness, to make unintermitted progress both in mental and spiritual preparation for their work, would soon invest Christianity in a new aspect, and much accelerate her ultimate triumph.

A large number of private Christians have been, during many years, studying the Bible, on the Sabbath, in an associated capacity. The good fruits of this practice have, unquestionably, appeared, and still more beneficial results may be reasonably expected. But has the harvest been according to the seed sown, or to the labor bestowed on the soil? How many of these Bible-class students have become mature Christians, — to whom has been given the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of Jesus, the eyes of their understanding being enlightened, so that they already know what is the hope of their calling and what are the riches of the glory of Christ's inheritance in the saints?

Do these individuals constitute, as they should, a large body of sound, intelligent, magnanimous, eminently spiritual men and women, the salt of every church, the light of every village and city? Increased knowledge of the Scriptures they undoubtedly have. But is it not, in many cases, the mere letter, the historical fact, the geographical locality, or biographical incident? Do they *live* in that world of rich conceptions and of imperishable truths which is opened to them in the Bible, and which is their purchased inheritance? Their advantages are ample; their privileges abundant. Should not their minds be pervaded with a profound sense of their obligations? Considerations of the most affecting character, drawn from the circumstances of this generation, and of the next, from the suffering Church of Christ, from heaven and from hell, demand that they should show, in their own persons, what the Bible can really accomplish in the mind and in the heart of man.

Once more, this is a period of high civilization. We cannot comfort ourselves with the notion, that it is a superficial age, one of shallow and unmeaning excitement. If it is a period of intense emotion, it is, of course, one of intellectual development. An age of awakened feeling is necessarily one of awakened thought. There may have been greater men in the ranks of science and literature in past times. But the number of acute, sagacious, strong-minded men is numerous in almost every Christian land. In some of the central countries of Europe, a large proportion of the youth acquire an education much superior to that obtained, generally, in the colleges of our country. In other lands, the ranks of physical science are thronged with laborers, constituting, with those devoted to mechanical improvements, a class of minds, whose influence is one of the

most pervading and predominant in society. Unhappily, a vast majority of these men are the idolaters of this present evil world, in the hot pursuit after dreams and shadows, following the bubble reputation with insane eagerness.

They are not, however, to be overlooked or despised. They are to be met by minds as sagacious and intrepid as their own. Mere feeling they esteem as straw ; naked exhortation as rotten wood. Their heart is as firm as a stone, yea, as hard as a piece of the nether millstone. The preacher or the Christian, who would affect them, must have an energy and an insight corresponding to their own ; not being afraid to grapple with them in any of their hiding-places ; to whose ministry, or to whose company, they are willingly, and yet unwillingly, attracted. Such men are not to be conquered by piety like that of the Moravians, simple-hearted, affectionate, and worthy of all commendation as it is. These have another sphere of labor, and most gloriously have they occupied it. But educated mind must be confronted with educated mind. By the same voice which calls us into the field, we are summoned to study the signs of the times, to understand the force of the enemy, and the temper of our own weapons, so that we may stand up in the shock of the conflict ; and, having done all, stand. Mere learning, how great soever it may be, is a miserable dependence. But the union of knowledge with humility and with sanctified affections, is mighty, through God, to the pulling down of the strongholds in which any class of unbelievers may have intrenched themselves.